

SUPPLEMENTS TO  
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

---



Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem  
*On the Life and the Passion  
of Christ*

A Coptic Apocryphon



By  
ROELOF VAN DEN BROEK

---

BRILL

Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem  
*On the Life and the Passion of Christ*

Supplements  
to  
Vigiliae Christianae

Texts and Studies of  
Early Christian Life and Language

*Editors*

J. den Boeft – B.D. Ehrman – J. van Oort  
D.T. Runia – C. Scholten – J.C.M. van Winden

VOLUME 118

Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem  
*On the Life and the Passion of Christ*

A Coptic Apocryphon

*By*  
Roelof van den Broek



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Broek, R. van den.

Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem on the life and the passion of Christ : a Coptic apocryphon / by Roelof van den Broek.

p. cm. – (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, ISSN 0920-623X ; v. 118)

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and indexes.

ISBN 978-90-04-23757-5 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-24197-8 (e-book)

1. Pseudo-Cyrill. 2. Pseudo-Cyrillus–Sermons. 3. Jesus Christ–Passion–Sermons. 4. Jesus Christ–Biography–Sermons. I. Pseudo-Cyrillus. Sermons. Selections. English. 2013. II. Title.

BR65.C936B76 2013

232–dc23

2012036580

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see [www.brill.com/brill-typeface](http://www.brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978-90-04-23757-5 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-24197-8 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	VII
Abbreviations .....	IX
I The Manuscripts .....	1
1 Manuscript M610 of the Pierpont Morgan Library .....	1
2 Manuscript E 16262 of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania .....	6
II The Text: Sources, Apocryphal Elements, and Date .....	9
1 The 'Writings of the Apostles' .....	9
2 The List of the Apostles .....	14
3 An Apocryphal Work on Pilate .....	33
4 The Chronology of Holy Week .....	39
5 The Divine Christ .....	50
6 The External Appearance of Jesus .....	56
7 Moses the Prophet-Killer .....	65
8 Date .....	69
III <i>On the Life and the Passion of Christ</i> and the Other Homilies	
Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem .....	71
1 Eight Cyrillian Homilies .....	71
1 <i>On the Life and the Passion of Christ</i> .....	73
2 <i>On the Passion and the Resurrection</i> .....	77
3 <i>On the Resurrection</i> .....	79
4 <i>On the Resurrection and the Passion</i> .....	81
5 <i>On New Sunday</i> .....	87
6 <i>On the Virgin Mary</i> .....	93
7 <i>On the Holy Cross</i> .....	98
8 <i>On Mary Magdalene</i> .....	105
2 A Cyrillian Cycle? .....	111

## PSEUDO-CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

*ON THE LIFE AND THE PASSION OF CHRIST*

Sigla and Editorial Principles .....	123
Text, Translation and Notes .....	124
Appendices .....	183
1 Texts on the Parents and the Worldly Professions of the Apostles .....	183
2 A Letter of Epiphanius of Salamis on the Chronology of Holy Week .....	186
Bibliography .....	191
Index of Graeco-Coptic Words .....	201
Index of Sources .....	206
1 Biblical Texts .....	206
2 Greek and Latin Texts .....	211
3 Coptic Texts .....	212
4 Arabic, Syriac and Ethiopic Texts .....	213
Index of Names and Subjects .....	214

## PREFACE

This book has been long in the making. I began working on it in the seventies of the last century, but as my research and my career took another direction I had to leave the project unfinished for several decades. In 2010, I took up the work again and I am glad to have been able to bring it to completion.

It is my pleasant duty to express my gratitude to the authorities of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, for having granted permission to publish the Library's Coptic Ms. M610, and to David Silverman, Director of the Egyptian Section of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, for permission to publish the material from its Coptic Ms. E 16262, making use of the excellent digital images created by Robert A. Kraft.

I also gratefully acknowledge the kind scholarly help I received from my colleagues Tito Orlandi and Paola Buzi (Italy), Robert A. Kraft and Janet Timbie (USA), Alin Suciu (Germany), and Tjitze Baarda, Christian Lange, Klaas Worp and, in particular, Jacques van der Vliet (The Netherlands). Finally, my thanks are due to Cis van Heertum, who revised my English text, and to the editors of the *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae*, who kindly accepted this book for publication in the series.

Roelof van den Broek  
Nijmegen, 21 June 2012





## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Analecta Bollandiana
CCA	Corpus Christianorum—Series Apocryphorum
CCL	Corpus Christianorum—Series Latina
CPC	Clavis Patrum Coptorum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
EPRO	Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire Romain
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
ROC	Revue de l'Orient Chrétien
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur altkirchlichen Literatur
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament



## CHAPTER ONE

### THE MANUSCRIPTS

A complete Coptic text of Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem's *Homily on the Life and the Passion of Christ* has been preserved in manuscript M610 of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. This manuscript is in excellent condition and the text can be read without any significant difficulties. Some fragments of another copy of the same homily have survived as a palimpsest in manuscript E 16262 of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. This manuscript, which only contains a small portion of the text, is very difficult to read.

#### 1. *Manuscript M610 of the Pierpont Morgan Library*

Manuscript M610 of the Pierpont Morgan Library once belonged to the library of the Coptic Monastery of Saint Michael, which was located in the Egyptian desert near present-day al-Ḥāmūli (Hamuli), a village in the Western part of the Faiyum. The Hamuli manuscripts were found in the spring of 1910 at the site of the monastery and bought by J.P. Morgan on December 1, 1911. The acquisition included forty-seven parchment codices (M566–600, M602–607 and M 609–614), which were made accessible to the scholarly world by a photographic facsimile edition that appeared in 1922.<sup>1</sup> Except for the information provided by the colophons of the manuscripts, virtually nothing is known about the history of the Monastery of Saint

---

<sup>1</sup> Extensive information on the discovery of the Hamuli Library, the site of the monastery and a full description of the manuscripts from Saint Michael's (eighty entries) is to be found in L. Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts, Vol. 4), Louvain: Peeters, 1993, which is accompanied by a second volume, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library: Album of Photographic Plates* (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts, 5), Louvain: Peeters, 1993 (with a photo of M610, fol 1<sup>ro</sup>, on Pl. 71 and pictures of the site of the Monastery of Saint Michael on Pls. 3–9). The facsimile edition was published under the supervision of H. Hyvernât: *Bybliothecae Pierpont Morgan Codices Coptici Photographice Expressi*, 57 vols., Rome: Vatican City, 1922. Only twelve copies were made; a photographic copy of one of them is in the Library of the University of Utrecht, made on behalf of Prof. Jan Zandee (1914–1991) in the late fifties of the last century.

Michael, which is remarkable because it must have been an important spiritual and scibal centre.<sup>2</sup> The earliest colophon is dated to AD 822/23 and the latest to AD 913/14. After the latter date, there is no evidence of the monastery's existence; it was possibly already destroyed and abandoned in the tenth century AD.<sup>3</sup>

M610 is a parchment codex of 25 folios (50 numbered pages), which contains only one text, ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem. The manuscript is described by Depuydt in his *Catalogue* under No. 64. A photographic copy was published in volume 44 of the facsimile edition. As is usual in Coptic manuscripts, the text of M610 is preceded by a superscription informing the reader about the author and the contents of the work and concluded by a colophon providing some information on the background of the manuscript. Both elements of M610 deserve some attention here. In Depuydt's *Catalogue*, the text is called a *Homily Delivered on Wednesday after Easter*, which is certainly wrong.<sup>4</sup> The homily deals with the life and the passion of Christ, especially with the events taking place on Wednesday and Thursday of Holy Week. The heading above the text says that Cyril delivered the homily 'in the early morning of the fourth day of the Great Pascha (πνοσ ἱπασχα).' The term 'Great Pascha' does not refer to the week after Easter, but to the week before Easter. It is an abbreviated form of what in Greek was called 'the (Great) Week of the Pascha [or: of the Passion], ἡ (μεγάλη) ἐβδομάς τοῦ πάσχα [or: τοῦ πάθους], which was the common term for Holy

<sup>2</sup> The colophons of the Hamuli manuscripts, and of many other texts, were published by A. van Lantschoot, *Recueil des colophons des manuscrits chrétiens d'Égypte*, Tome I: *Les colophons coptes des manuscrits sahidiques*, Fasc. 1: *Textes*, Fasc. 2: *Notes et Tables* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 1), Louvain: J.-B. Ista, 1929 (no more published, cited as '*Colophons coptes*, 1/2').

<sup>3</sup> The manuscripts were found 'hidden away in a stone vat' (H. Hyvernat, 'The J.P. Morgan Collection of Coptic Manuscripts', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 31 (1912) 55), which points to a (successful) attempt to protect them from being destroyed.

<sup>4</sup> Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 129–131. The same title had already been given to the text by H. Hyvernat, *A Check List of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, New York: Privately printed [The Gilliss Press], 1919, p. 16: 'Synaxary. Cyril of Jerusalem. Exegesis delivered on Easter Wednesday, at the morning service,' and by Van Lantschoot, *Colophons coptes*, 1, 51 (No. XXIX): 'homélie de S. Cyrille de Jérusalem sur le mercredi après la Résurrection.' The scholar who first assigned the correct title to M610 was Tito Orlandi, 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme nella letteratura copta', *Vetera Christianorum* 9 (1972), 160: 'In Passionem Domini,' followed by his pupil Antonella Campagnano, *Ps. Cirillo di Gerusalemme. Omelie copte sulla Passione, sulla Croce e sulla Vergine* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' Antichità, LXV), Milano: Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1980, 10 ('In passionem Domini').

Week.<sup>5</sup> In § 93 of the homily, the full expression is used, as Jesus says: ‘they will put me on the wood at the sixth hour of Great Preparation Day of the Great Week of the Pascha (ΤΙΝΟΣ ἡΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΗ ἡΤΙΝΟΣ ἡΡΕΒΔΟΜΑΣ ἡΠΠΑΣΧΑ).’ The abbreviated form ‘Great Pascha’ was not uncommon in Coptic: in a story about archbishop Theophilus of Alexandria and the archimandrite Horsiesius, it is told that they went to the main church of Alexandria on ‘the Great Preparation-day of the Great Pascha (ἡ ΤΙΝΟΣ ἡΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΗ ἡΠΙΝΟΣ ἡΠΠΑΣΧΑ),’ i.e. on Good Friday.<sup>6</sup> That the text of M610 is not a homily delivered on the fourth day after Easter, and certainly not by Cyril of Jerusalem, will become evident in the course of the next chapter. Therefore, the text should be indicated as ‘Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Life and the Passion of Christ*.’

The colophon of M610 provides some information on the donor and his intentions and on the monastery of Saint Michael, though it does not offer a date. It runs as follows:

Lord, Jesus Christ, bless and guard the life of the archpriest Father<sup>7</sup> Paul. Pray for him, my holy fathers, for he has provided for this book by his own labours.<sup>8</sup> He has donated it to the (Monastery of the) Holy Archangel Michael, at the monastic settlement in the desert near Soupouhes in the nome of the Faiyum, in order that the Archangel Michael may beseech the King, Christ, on his behalf to forgive him his sins, and he also may hear this word from the Lord Jesus: ‘Come to me, good and faithful servant, go in to the joy of your Lord!’ Amen.

The identity of the archpriest Paul (παγλε) is unknown. In the Coptic colophons collected by Van Lantschoot, six or seven other Pauls are mentioned, but none of them can be identified with the donor of M610.<sup>9</sup> The biblical text

<sup>5</sup> See G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961, 396, s.v. ἐβδομάς B.3.a.

<sup>6</sup> W.E. Crum (ed.), *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI–VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften* (Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Straßburg, 18), Straßburg: K.J. Trübner, 1915, 14 (S. 47, text) and 68 (German transl.). In Greek, ἡ ἁγία or μεγάλη παρασκευή is Good Friday, Lampe, *Lexicon*, 1025b, s.v. 2.e.

<sup>7</sup> Coptic ππαπα (= Greek ὁ πάπας), which was the common respectful title of priests; see Lampe, *Lexicon*, 1006a, s.v.

<sup>8</sup> This expression, which means ‘at his own expense,’ is frequently used with respect to donors; cf. Van Lantschoot, *Colophons coptes*, 2, 148, s.v. εἰσε.

<sup>9</sup> Van Lantschoot, *Colophons coptes*, 1, 16 (No. 7, 2, 9: παπα παγλε; AD 854/55); 39 (No. 20, 15: παπα παγλι; AD 892/93); 68 (No. 41, A 6: παπα παγλι; AD 897/901; probably the same as No. 20, 15); 70 (No. 43, 3–4: deacon παγλω; before Januari AD 996; Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 278), 89 (No. 55, A 6: donor παγλι, the son of Victor, from Perpnoute in the Faiyum; AD 939/940), 96 (No. 58, B 16–17: scribe παγλω; AD 979/80); 135 (No. 80, A 17: archimandrite παγλε; AD 1112).

quoted at the end of the colophon (Matthew 25:21 and 23) is found in five other colophons in van Lantschoot's collection. These colophons are of a rather late date, between AD 913/14 and AD 1004, which might be an indication that M610, too, was produced in the same period or a little earlier.<sup>10</sup>

A more exact indication of the date of the manuscript is provided by the information the colophon has to offer on the location of the monastery. The site of the Monastery of Saint Michael is designated as ΕΙΣΑΝΤΑΥ ΝΙΣΟΥΠΟΥΖΕC. The word ΕΙΣΑΝΤΑΥ (*int. al.* also written as ΦΑΝΤΑΥ, ΕΙΣΑΝΤΟΥ, ΦΑΝΤΟΥ) is usually thought to contain the word ΠΤΟΥ, which means 'mountain,' but also a 'community of hermits, monastery.' The word ΣΑΝΤΟΥ has the meaning of 'mountainous country,' but it could also mean 'a settlement of monks in the desert.' The location of such a settlement, mostly a monastery, could be indicated by the addition of the name of a nearby village, such as Soupouhes or Erêbe.<sup>11</sup> If used without a place-name, the word ΕΙΣΑΝΤΟΥ could apparently indicate a monastic settlement in the desert that was well-known in a specific region ('the Monastery').<sup>12</sup> The name of the nearby village, Soupouhes (ΝΙΣΟΥΠΟΥΖΕC, also spelled ΝΙΣΟΥΠΟΥΖΕC and ΝΙΣΟΥΠΟΥΖΟC) is only known from the colophons of the Hamuli manuscripts. In these colophons, the monastery is also associated with the place-names Perkithoout and Tmonē n-Alli, but these names do not occur after the year AD 861, whereas Soupouhes is first mentioned in a manuscript of AD 894. This means that the association of the monastery with the village Soupouhes must have occurred some time between AD 861 and 894.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the manuscript of M610 was most probably produced in the last decades of the ninth century AD. This date is confirmed by the binding of the manuscript, which has been dated to the 'latter part of the ninth century.'<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Van Lantschoot, *Colophons coptes*, 1, 79 (No. 50, 12–14; = M579, the latest dated manuscript of the Hamuli Library: AD 913/14), 82 (No. 51<sup>vo</sup>, 14–17; dated AD 927/28), 167 (No. 98, 15–18; dated AD 1031/32), 210 (No. 118, 1<sup>vo</sup>, 26–29; dated AD 1003), 213 (No. 119<sup>vo</sup>, 25–28; dated 1004).

<sup>11</sup> See W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939, 441, s.v. ΠΟΥ and ΣΑΝΤΟΥ; Van Lantschoot, *Colophons coptes*, 2, 7, note 3, 1. For Erêbe (Rife), see the colophon of a collection of stories about Cyril of Alexandria, in Crum, *Papyruscodex*, 47 (text), 105 (German transl.), which mentions the monastery of Patriarch Severus 'at the monastic site of Erêbe (ΕΙΣΑΝΤΟΥ ΝΙΣΟΥΠΟΥΖΕC), South of the city of Siout.'

<sup>12</sup> See Depuydt, *Catalogue*, CVII–CIX.

<sup>13</sup> Depuydt, *Catalogue*, CVI.

<sup>14</sup> Thus T.C. Petersen in an unpublished study, *Coptic Bindings in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, finished ca. 1948, typescript kept at the Library; see Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 129, n. 1. According to the *Detailed descriptions and additional bibliographies*, composed in 1947 and available at the website of the Library, the binding of M610 appears to be the work of the same binder who bound M600, which dates from AD 905/906 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 312). The same *Detailed descriptions* notes about the decoration of M610 that it is close to that of M608:

The language of the manuscript is Sahidic with some Faiyumic elements. The Faiyumic influence is stronger in the colophon than in the text itself, indicating that the scribe came from the Faiyum district. There is, however, only one instance of the typically Faiyumic replacement of Sahidic *r* (ρ) by *l* (λ), in §157 (ἀπλῆλιος, April).<sup>15</sup> Throughout the entire manuscript, the scribe shows a certain predilection for spellings which in itself are possible in Sahidic but are more common in Faiyumic. Instances of Faiyumic spellings in the colophon are: ⲡⲧⲁϣ (S.: ⲡⲧⲟϣ), ⲃⲓ (S. ϥⲓ), ⲧⲁϣ (S. ⲧⲟϣ). In the homily itself there are only a few spellings that are considered typically Faiyumic, e.g. ⲃⲉⲕⲏ in §1 (S. ⲃⲉⲕⲉ). In some cases the superlinear stroke is replaced by the letter ⲉ, which can also be seen as an instance of Faiyumic influence:<sup>16</sup> ϣⲱⲣⲉⲡ, ϣⲓⲣⲉⲙ (both in the heading), ⲡⲭⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉⲛϥⲩⲛⲧⲁⲓⲙⲁ (§7), ⲱⲕⲉⲙ (§58), ⲉⲛⲧⲏⲭⲧⲏ̅ (§68, stat. pronom. of ⲉⲛⲉ<sup>17</sup>), ⲉⲙⲓⲛⲁϣ (§91), ⲉⲭⲉⲛ (§114), ϣⲉⲣⲱⲣⲉ (§119), ⲙⲁ ⲡⲉⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ (§142), ⲉⲙⲕⲁⲗ (§157). Another peculiarity of the manuscript's language is that the plural article ⲡ is sometimes written ⲛⲉ, even where this is very unusual in Sahidic: ⲛⲉⲁⲡⲟϥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ (§5), ⲛⲉⲓⲣⲓϥⲉ (§§6, 108), ⲛⲉϥⲱⲛⲧ̅ (§36), ⲛⲉϣⲁⲭⲉ (§161). The superlinear stroke is applied irregularly and without any recognizable system, and the same holds for the punctuation. In these respects, the present publication does not reproduce the manuscript of M610.<sup>18</sup> As will become evident in the next section, the present edition of Pseudo-Cyril's *Homily on the Life and the Passion of Christ* is almost exclusively based on M610. For that reason, I have indicated the manuscript's lacunae in my edition, even though in most cases they can be filled with certainty. My primary aim, however, was not to edit the manuscript but to publish the text it contains and to explain its contents as thoroughly as I am able to do. As a rule, the spelling of words follows that of the manuscript; corrections are only made where this seemed unavoidable.<sup>19</sup>

---

'The drawing of the animals and firm, well organized interlace might be the work of the same artist.' The date of M608 is uncertain; it contains a second 'memorial,' dated 995/996, but the manuscript itself might be much older (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 279).

<sup>15</sup> See p. 179, note 183.

<sup>16</sup> Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik, mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch*, 2. Aufl., München: C.H. Beck, 1961, 11 (§49); the same phenomenon in Bohairic.

<sup>17</sup> W.C. Till, *Dialektgrammatik*, 44 (§204); Crum, 78b.

<sup>18</sup> See p. 121 below. On the superlinear stroke and punctuation in Coptic, see B. Layton, *A Coptic Grammar, with Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Band 20), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000, 31f. (§38) and 20 (§19).

<sup>19</sup> An example of an unusual spelling is ⲙⲉⲧⲭⲏⲛⲁⲗ, 'eyebrow' (§114), whereas ⲡⲭⲏⲗ / ⲉⲙⲕⲏⲗ is usual in Sahidic and ⲙⲉⲭⲉⲛⲗ / ⲙⲁⲡⲭⲉⲛⲗ in Bohairic (Crum, *Dictionary*, 57a, s.v.).



2. *Manuscript E 16262 of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania*

Manuscript E 16262 of the University of Pennsylvania is a parchment palimpsest of which three fragmentary folios have been preserved. The overwriting contains parts of a *Homily on the Resurrection of Lazarus*, attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria, of which a complete text is found in Pierpont Morgan M595.<sup>20</sup> In 1979 Janet Timbie of the University of Pennsylvania made a preliminary transcript of the then legible parts of the underwriting and identified the text of at least four of the six pages as belonging to the same Pseudo-Cyrrillian homily that was also contained in M610. The underwriting is very difficult to read, but thanks to Timbie's transcript and the excellent digital images of the fragments created by Robert A. Kraft, it is possible to determine with some certainty which parts of Pseudo-Cyrril's homily are represented on the Pennsylvania palimpsest.<sup>21</sup>

The first observation to be made is that the underwriting of the recto of the first leaf (E 16262-1; written upside down) does not belong to Pseudo-Cyrril's *Homily on the Life and the Passion of Christ*. The first column of the first page contains a reference to the healing at the Pool of Bethesda (John 5:2–9): mention is made of 'sick people' (ἁλῶν; cf. John 5:3: ἡνεῳῶνε, Gr. τῶν ἀσθενούντων), 'the cistern' (τὸ κολωνβηθρα; cf. John 5:2 and 7: τὸ κολυμβηθρα, Gr. κολυμβήθρα) and 'the angel' (παγγέλως), who stirs the water (John 5:4, in many manuscripts and versions, not in the Sahidic translation).<sup>22</sup> Pseudo-Cyrril's homily does not contain any reference to the Bethesda story, which implies that the text on the recto of the first folio definitely belongs to another work. Since the few legible words on the verso are not reminiscent of Pseudo-Cyrril's text either, we may safely assume that the underwriting of

<sup>20</sup> Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 348; Facs. ed., vol. 43, 217–237; edited by J.B. Bernardin, 'The resurrection of Lazarus,' *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 57 (1940) 262–290. I here wish to thank Alin Suci, who was the first to draw my attention to the Pennsylvania fragments. A single leaf of another manuscript of this text (pagination ٢٤٦–٢٤٧ [123–124]) is kept in the British Library, Or. 13886 (2); see B. Layton, *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired since the Year 1906*, London: The British Library, 1987, 83 (No. 79).

<sup>21</sup> I am very grateful for their generous support. Janet Timbie put her transcript of the underwriting at my disposal and Robert A. Kraft, who compiled a catalogue of the manuscripts owned by the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania (to be found at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/ppenn/museum/coptic/0000index.html#coptic2>), offered me very useful information about his project and kindly allowed me to make use of his digital images.

<sup>22</sup> See G. Horner (ed.), *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic*, Vol. III: *The Gospel of John*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

folio E 16262-1 was never part of another manuscript of the *Homily on the Life and the Passion of Christ*.

The underwriting of the other two folios of E 16262 do indeed contain portions of Pseudo-Cyril's homily. Unfortunately, these folios are severely damaged, so that considerable parts of the text have been lost. Moreover, the first column on the recto of folio 3 is completely illegible and the state of the second column on the verso of the same leaf is not much better. As a matter of fact, the only portions of the text that can be read without much difficulties are the first column on the verso of folio 3, the first column on the recto of folio 2 and the second column on the verso of the same leaf. The preserved part of the third folio, E 16262-3, runs parallel with M610, p. 2b, 20–p. 3b, 9 [= §§ 5–7 of the present edition]. The second folio, E 16262-2, contains the text of M610, p. 6b, 2–p. 7b, 20 [= §§ 15–19 of the present edition]. In addition to the illegibility of most of the underwriting, the poor state of the manuscript makes E 16262 of limited value for a critical edition of Pseudo-Cyril's homily. It is noteworthy, however, that M610 sometimes adds words which are in themselves not essential and are lacking in E 16262. This might be an indication that M610 represents a later development of the text. All indubitable variant readings of E 16262-3 and 2 have been recorded in the critical apparatus to the edition of the text below.



## CHAPTER TWO

### THE TEXT: SOURCES, APOCRYPHAL ELEMENTS, AND DATE

#### 1. *The 'Writings of the Apostles'*

The most characteristic feature of Pseudo-Cyril's *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* is its unrestrained blending of canonical and apocryphal traditions. The basic facts concerning the last dramatic events of Jesus' life derive, of course, from the Gospels. But their presentation contains so many additions and changes that the Gospel story evidently was not the author's first and principal source. As a matter of fact, the author himself claims to reproduce the contents of what he calls 'the writings of our fathers, the apostles.' These writings are said (§ 5) to have been found at Jerusalem, in the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, apparently in the church which had been built on Sion ca. AD 340.<sup>1</sup> The story of this discovery is told in §§ 7 and 8. It narrates how the deacon Theodosius sought among the books, apparently those of the library of the Sion church, for the 'writings of our fathers, the apostles.' What he found was a small parchment volume, hardly measuring a span and entirely written in shorthand. He brought it to Cyril in the episcopal palace, who passed it to Apa Bachios, a shorthand expert.

By offering this account at the outset of his work, the author wishes to enhance the credibility of the peculiar views and uncanonical facts he is about to present by ascribing them to an apostolic source. The discovery of an ancient book containing authentic and hitherto unknown information was a familiar literary motif in Antiquity.<sup>2</sup> This device was also frequently applied in Coptic literature, always with a view to invest unfamiliar

---

<sup>1</sup> See p. 125, n. 14.

<sup>2</sup> A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris: Gabalda, 1944, 319–324; W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike, mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Hypomnemata, 24), Göttingen 1970, especially 134–138; idem, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I, 2), München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971, especially 68–70; A.D. Baum, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum, mit ausgewählten Quellentexten samt deutscher Übersetzung* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 138), Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2001; see also the study by J.L. Hagen, mentioned in note 4 below.

ideas with apostolicity and thus reliability. There are several Coptic texts allegedly based for the greater part on writings of the apostles discovered in (the library at) Jerusalem. In an *Encomium on Saint John the Baptist*, by Pseudo-John Chrysostom, the author claims to reproduce 'the statements that we have found in the ancient manuscripts which the Apostles wrote and deposited in the Library of the Holy City Jerusalem.' His story of the discovery closely resembles that of Pseudo-Cyril: 'I went through the books, (...) and I found a little old volume which concerned the Apostles.' The book turns out to be an account by the apostles themselves about a heavenly journey they had made at the command of Jesus.<sup>3</sup> The same claim is found in two homilies attributed to Timothy of Alexandria, one on the Angel of Death, Abbaton, and the other on Michael the Archangel. In the latter homily, Timothy claims that he found this apostolic writing in the house of the mother of Proclus (= Prochorus?), the disciple of John, where it was used as a phylactery.<sup>4</sup> *The History of Joseph the Carpenter* presents itself as having been written by the apostles and deposited by them in the library at Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> A partly unpublished sermon on the Virgin Mary and the birth of Christ contains a peculiar story about a pearl that the unknown author claims to have found in the Jerusalem library.<sup>6</sup> Other works with non-canonical materials on the Virgin Mary also make reference to apostolic writings allegedly

<sup>3</sup> A.E.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London: British Museum, 1913, 137 ff. (text), 343 ff. (transl.).

<sup>4</sup> A.E.W. Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms*, London: British Museum, 1914, 247 (text), 495 (transl.), and idem, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London: British Museum, 1915, 513 (text), 1022 (transl.) and 520 (text), 1029 (transl.). The homily on the Angel of Death, Abbaton (the superscription in the manuscript calls the work an *εγκώμιον*; *Coptic Martyrdoms*, p. 225), and the *Encomium on the Four Bodiless Living Creatures*, mentioned in note 8, are discussed by J.L. Hagen, 'The Diaries of the Apostles: "Manuscript Find" and "Manuscript Fiction" in Coptic Homilies and other Literary Texts,' in M. Immerzeel and J. van der Vliet (eds.), *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium*. Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies, Leiden, 27 August–2 September 2000 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 133), Louvain-Paris-Dudley, Ma.: Uitgeverij Peeters and Departement Oosterse Studies, 2004, Vol. I, 349–365.

<sup>5</sup> Edited by P. de Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca*, Göttingen 1883 (reprint Osnabrück 1972), 1; cf. S. Morenz, *Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann* (TU 56), Berlin-Leipzig 1951, 1 and 28–29 (commentary).

<sup>6</sup> This story is found in Copt. Ms. 36 of the John Rylands Library at Manchester, fol. 2<sup>vo</sup> [= p. 351], a.18–fol. 2<sup>vo</sup> [= p. 352], b.17) (= No. 72 in W.E. Crum, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library Manchester*, Manchester / London: At the University Press / B. Quaritch, and Sherrat and Huges, 1909, 36) and also in a Coptic Ms. of the University Library at Utrecht (fol. 1<sup>ro</sup> [= p. 31], a.2–fol. 1<sup>ro</sup> [= p. 32], b.2). The passage on the pearl in the Manchester Ms. was edited and translated by A. van Lantschoot, 'A propos du Physiologus,' in *Coptic Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing Crum* (Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute, 2),

containing these materials. In AD 567, Theodosius of Alexandria delivered a sermon on the *Transitus Mariae* in which he claimed to have found his story in ancient writings from Jerusalem which had come into his hands in the library of St. Mark's at Alexandria.<sup>7</sup> A *Homily on Mary Theotokos*, falsely attributed to Basil of Caesarea, contains a *Letter of Luke*, which is said to have been found in the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark.<sup>8</sup> In an interesting Encomium on Mary Magdalene, attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, the author claims to have found the description of her life 'in the library of the Holy City, written in Egyptian (εγρηγε νεκρηπτιος).'<sup>9</sup> In an Ethiopic homily on the *Transitus Mariae*, also ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem, the author also claims to reproduce a report on the Virgin's death, written by Prochorus, the disciple of John, and found in the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark.<sup>10</sup>

This evidence shows that Pseudo-Cyril's claim to quote from a book with apostolic writings found in the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, is not to be taken literally. It is a common literary motif which signals to the modern reader that the passages that follow will contain apocryphal or heretical materials.

Pseudo-Cyril's information on the writings contained in the 'small book of parchment' is not very clear. He describes it as containing 'the commandments of Christ (ἡτοῦτο ἡπικῶ) and what happened to him and the apostles, and the way Judas became a traitor and delivered Jesus for money' (§ 7), which is a rather short and incomplete summary of the homily's contents. The 'commandments of Christ' most probably refer to the calling of the

---

Boston, Mass.: The Byzantine Institute, 1950, 353–354. For the edition of another fragment of the Utrecht Ms. (on the phoenix), and a short discussion of the text as a whole, see p. 95. n. 24 below.

<sup>7</sup> M. Chaîne, 'Sermon de Théodose patriarche d'Alexandrie sur la Dormition et l'Assomption de la Vierge,' *ROC* 29 (1933/34) 282 (text), 304 (transl.).

<sup>8</sup> M. Chaîne, 'Catéchèse attribuée à saint Basile de Césarée. Une lettre apocryphe de saint Luc,' *ROC* 23 (1922/23) 155 (text), 156 (transl.), 277 (text), 293 (transl.). The same location is mentioned in the *Encomium on the Four Bodiless Living Creatures*, 18, attributed to John Chrysostom, edited and translated by C.S. Wansink, in L. Depuydt (ed.), *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library. Seven Coptic Homilies Attributed to Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and Euodius of Rome* (CSCO 524 [text] and 525 [transl.]), Louvain, 1991, 31–32 (text), 32 (transl.). In Jerusalem, 'Chrysostom' allegedly studied 'the ancient holy writings,' among which a volume (τοῦτο) written by the apostles (the Jerusalem library is not explicitly mentioned).

<sup>9</sup> R.G. Coquin & G. Godron, 'Un encomium copte sur Marie-Madeleine attribué à Cyrille de Jérusalem,' *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 90 (1990) 176 (fol. 1<sup>vo</sup> b, 24–33; text), 201 (French translation). The text is of interest, because one of its main sources is the *Cave of Treasures*, which is only known in Syriac. See on this text also below, pp. 105–111.

<sup>10</sup> *Cyriilli Hierosolymitani Homilia*, 23, 24, 26, 80–82 (ed. A. Arras, CSCO 351, 10–11, 30–31, transl. Idem, CSCO 352, 7–8, 22–23).

disciples, which is related in §§ 13–15. The author pretends to quote the rediscovered parchment book from § 9 onwards (§ 8: ‘he found it written as follows’), but §§ 9–11, which provide some information on the apostles, derive from a separate source, as will be shown below. This source has been incorporated into the homily in a rather awkward manner, for in § 12 the author again says that he is reproducing the contents of the books: ‘These are the facts we found in the writings of which we have spoken before.’ The text continues with the apostles relating how they were chosen by Jesus and how many of Jesus’ miracles they had seen with their own eyes (§§ 12–20). They also explain why they decided to write this book (§§ 17–18), namely because they know that they will be killed ‘before we have preached the Gospel to all the cities.’ Then the faithful will copy the book into other books ‘and take them from city to city and from country to country and from province to province, so that when the enemies of Christ kill us it will be as if we are still preaching to you.’ However, the author stops quoting from the alleged writings of the apostles as of § 20. From then on, the apostles no longer speak about themselves in the first plural form but they are simply spoken of as ‘the disciples,’ with the exception of § 78, which relates a transfiguration of Jesus and was obviously taken from a separate source.<sup>11</sup> From § 22 onwards, the author apparently follows a specific source containing a variety of apocryphal material not to be found in the canonical Gospels. He introduces this source by saying, in § 21: ‘But we shall not amply speak about the things we found written in the holy Gospels.’

The homily of Pseudo-Cyril contains many apocryphal elements of unknown provenance, but there are at least three apocryphal traditions that can be identified with certainty. The first is a late Byzantine and Coptic work on the names, worldly professions and other particulars of the apostles (§ 10).<sup>12</sup> The second tradition is an unfamiliar chronology of Holy Week, which ultimately derives from the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (first half of the third century).<sup>13</sup> This work is quoted by Epiphanius of Salamis as the *Διάταξις* (or, plur.: *Διατάξεις*) τῶν ἀποστόλων, whereas the author of the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum* refers to it as the *Liber Canonum*.<sup>14</sup> The *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (c. 380), which almost completely incorporated the *Didascalia*

<sup>11</sup> See p. 51.

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 14–33.

<sup>13</sup> See pp. 39–50.

<sup>14</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 45, 4, 5 (ed. K. Holl, *Panarion haer.* 34–64 [GCS 31], 2. bearbeitete Aufl., 1. herausgegeben von J. Dummer, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1980, 202); 70, 10, 2 ff. (K. Holl, *Panarion haer.* 65–80. *De fide* [GCS 37], 2. bearbeitete Aufl., herausgegeben vom J. Dummer,

(but not its uncanonical chronology of Holy Week), were mostly entitled: Διαταγαὶ τῶν ἀγίων ἀποστόλων, but instead of Διαταγαὶ also the word Διατάξεις was used.<sup>15</sup> All these works dealing with Church order pretended to have been written by the apostles themselves, in the first plural form,—a claim that is also maintained in Pseudo-Cyril, albeit only for a while, as we saw above. There is no doubt that a later version of the Passion as told in the *Didascalia* or Διδάξεις/Διατάξεις or *Canones* of the Apostles was one of the (indirect) sources of Pseudo-Cyril's homily. The name assigned to his source by Pseudo-Cyril very likely points to this connection with the tradition of the *Didascalia*. In § 108 he says that he has been preaching for a long time 'from the θεσμοί of the apostles,' and in § 154, to the end of his sermon, he states that the things thus far related had happened to our Lord according to 'what has been written in the θεσμοί of the apostles.' In ecclesiastical usage, the word θεσμός, 'law,' 'ordinance,' is nearly synonymous with 'canon,' 'constitution.'<sup>16</sup> One might even consider the possibility that also the words ἡτοιμασθέντες in § 7 might also refer to the θεσμοί of §§ 108 and 154 and should be translated as 'the Constitutions of Christ,' since the word ἡτοιμασθέντες can be the translation of, *int. al.*, the Greek words διατάξεις, διαταγή, and θεσμός.<sup>17</sup> This interpretation seems unlikely, however, as the works dealing with Church order, called Διατάξεις, Διαταγαί, *Canones* and the like, are always ascribed to the apostles and never to Christ himself.

There is no need to assume, however, that Pseudo-Cyril really had a work called *The θεσμοί of the Apostles* at his disposal. He most probably found the references to this writing in a third source, which seems to have been his main source from § 22 onwards, an apocryphal work on Pilate.<sup>18</sup> Before turning to a discussion of this source, we have to look at the document with which the book found by the deacon Theodosius opens, the List of the Apostles.

---

Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985, 243 ff.); Διατάξεις: 80, 7, 1 (Holl, GCS 37, 492); *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, 13, ad 6, 3 (PG 56, 707): 'sicut apostoli interpretantur in libro Canonum' (reference to *Didascalia*, 15).

<sup>15</sup> M. Metzger (ed.), *Les Constitutions apostoliques*, vol. 1 (SC 320), Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985, 101, critical apparatus and note 1.

<sup>16</sup> See, for instance, Methodius of Olympus, *De lepra*, 9, 1 (ed. G.N. Bonwetsch, *Methodius* [GCS 27], Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1917, 462): ταῦτα γὰρ κανόνες εἰσὶν καὶ θεσμοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας; cf. Lampe, *Lexicon*, 646 s.v. θεσμός.

<sup>17</sup> cf. Crum, *Dictionary*, 452a s.v.

<sup>18</sup> See pp. 34–38.



## 2. *The List of the Apostles*

According to Pseudo-Cyril, the book found in the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, began as follows (§9): ‘This is the calling of Jesus Christ with which he has called (the apostles). In peace. Amen.’ These words reflect the usual heading of a text in Coptic manuscripts: a short summary of its contents, ending with ‘In (the) peace (of God). Amen.’ The author here apparently introduced some information from a work on the apostles with an independent circulation. The heading is followed by a list of the apostles, with particulars on their worldly professions (§10). This list also included Matthias, Mark and Paul, as can be inferred from Pseudo-Cyril’s statement that these three had not yet been chosen at the time that ‘this writing’ was written (§11). The suggestion is that the apostolic writings found in the house of Mary had been composed in the period between Jesus’ Resurrection and the coming down of the Spirit (§5). As there is no specific reason for Pseudo-Cyril to mention Matthias, Mark and Paul in this connection, whose names are nevertheless added to those of the other apostles, it is obvious that he encountered them in his source.

The list bears the marks of a rather late production. The inclusion of Mark, Luke, and Paul into the collegium of the apostles is first found in a work by Pseudo-Epiphanius which dates from the beginning or the middle of the eighth century.<sup>19</sup> But the addition of fabulous data concerning the apostles’ parents, their birthplaces, worldly professions and other personal particulars is only found in a late Byzantine text called *The Names of the Twelve Apostles and their Parents*.<sup>20</sup> Some of the data provided by this text, which

<sup>19</sup> Edited by Th. Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae. Indices apostolorum discipulorumque domini Dorotheo, Epiphania, Hippolyto aliisque vindicata*, Lipsiae: Teubner, 1907, 114–117. A thorough study of the various literary traditions on the apostles and other pupils of Jesus in Th. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte* (TU, 31, 3), Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1907; on the date of Pseudo-Epiphanius, *ibidem*, 349–351; much material from oriental sources has been collected by F. Haase, *Apostel und Evangelisten in den orientalischen Überlieferungen* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, IX, 1–3), Münster i. W.: Asschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.

<sup>20</sup> Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae*, 202–204; see below Appendix 1.1; the oldest manuscript (A, Ms. Paris. 1085) dates from the year 1001. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden*, 168, called it ‘ein ganz fabelhaftes Machwerk.’ It was already discussed by R.A. Lipsius in his monumental *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte*, I, Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1883, 206–207. Lipsius also noted its anomalous position within the apocryphal traditions about the apostles: ‘Die Notizen über Aeltern und Geburtsorte sind soviel ich sehe ganz wertlos und haben, soweit sie nicht aus dem NT zu entnehmen waren, schlechthin keinen Halt in der sonstigen Tradition.’

can hardly be older than the eighth or even the ninth century, recur not only in the list in Pseudo-Cyril but also, and even to a greater extent, in two other literary products of Egyptian Christianity: in a Coptic homily, *On the Resurrection and the Apostles*, attributed to John Chrysostom,<sup>21</sup> and in the fourth section of *The Lamp of Darkness*, a famous Arabic encyclopedic work written by the Coptic scholar Abu 'l-Barakat, also known as Ibn Kabar. A complete scholarly edition of the *Lamp* does not exist, though two translations of the fourth section are available.<sup>22</sup> A closely related list is also found on three Coptic ostraca, though, unfortunately, neither of them is complete.<sup>23</sup> Finally, a similar tradition about the apostles must have been known to the author of a unedited Coptic homily *On New Sunday*, which was also attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem.<sup>24</sup>

Unfortunately, the Greek text is no longer extant in its original form. The list breaks off with the father of Simon Zelotes, the eleventh apostle; the name of his mother and the rest of the list is lost. In two manuscripts (B and C, dating from the 13th and 12th centuries respectively) the name of

<sup>21</sup> Edited by Z. Pleše, in L. Depuydt (gen. ed.), *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, 78–79; see below Appendix 1.2.

<sup>22</sup> On this author, see G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, II: *Die Schriftsteller bis zur Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Studi e Testi, 133), Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1947, 438–445, and Azis S. Atiya, 'Ibn Kabar,' *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 4, New York: Macmillan, 1991, 1267–1268. Unfortunately, there exists only a scholarly edition of the first two sections of this work, edited by L. Villecourt, *Livre de la Lampe des ténèbres et de l'exposition (lumineuse) du service (de l'Eglise)* (Patrologia Orientalis 20, 4), Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1929. The greater part of section four, about the apostles, was translated from Cod. Vat. ar. Nr. 623, p. 71 ff., by Georg Graf in Haase, *Apostel und Evangelisten*, 295–300. A translation of the entire *Lamp* into a somewhat peculiar English, made from an unspecified manuscript by Dr. William A. Hanna, is to be found on the internet ([www.zeitun-eg.org/Ibn\\_Kabar](http://www.zeitun-eg.org/Ibn_Kabar)): *The Lamp that Lights the Darkness in Clarifying the Service*, Chapter Four on pp. 68–73. In Graf's translation, most of the names of the parents of the apostles are not filled in (indicated by ...), probably because they were left out or had become illegible in the manuscript. In Hanna's translation the parents are named, apparently because they were found in his manuscript, but their names do not always agree with those of the Greek text.

<sup>23</sup> W.E. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and Others*, London: The Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902, No. 436, p. 72 (section Texts) and 74 (section Translations and Commentaries); A. Biedenkopf-Ziehner, *Koptische Ostraka*, I: *Ostraka aus dem Britischen Museum in London. Mit Einführung in das Formular der vorgelegten Urkunden*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000, 303–306, No. BM 42 (inv. No. 50 235), and Plate 43; A. Delattre, 'Un nouveau témoin des listes d'apôtres apocryphes en copte,' *Orientalia* 79 (2010), 74–79. The three ostraca offer the same text, of which the copy published by Biedenkopf-Ziehner is the most complete (eight apostles).

<sup>24</sup> See p. 19, n. 28; for this homily, see pp. 87–92.

Judas Iscariot has been added, without any further information, apparently to complete the list of the twelve disciples of Jesus.<sup>25</sup> This might be correct, because Judas Iscariot was mentioned in many of such lists, including that of Pseudo-Cyril. There is no certainty on this point, however, as Pseudo-John Chrysostom and Ibn Kabar do not mention Judas. In the second part of their lists, the apostles appear in different orders, while some of them are left out and replaced by others.

The correspondences between these texts will become visible from the following juxtaposition:<sup>26</sup>

<i>Greek Text</i>	<i>Ps. Cyril</i>	<i>Ps. John Chrys.</i>	<i>Ostraca</i>	<i>Ibn Kabar</i>
1, 2 Peter, Andrew	1, 4 Peter, John  2, 3 Andrew, James	1, 2 Peter, Andrew	1, 2 Peter, Andrew 3, 4 James, John	1, 2 Peter, Andrew
father: John mother: Joannē		John Bariōna		Youna [Jûnâ] Youanna [Jûnânâ]
profess.: fishermen		fishermen	fishermen	fishermen
from:	Bethsaida		Bethsaida	Bethsaida
3, 4 James, John father: Zebedee mother: Hierokleia		4, 3 John, James Zebedee Hieokē		2, 3 James, John Zabadi [Zabadi] Thaeophelia, Mary [Tâûklijjâ, Maria]
profess.: fishermen		fishermen		fishermen
from: Bethsaida			Bethsaida	Bethsaida

<sup>25</sup> Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae*, 204, in the critical apparatus. Ms. D, from the year 1344, contains an addition on the various names that were thought to indicate the same apostle, namely 'that Luke called Thaddaeus Judas the son of James (Luke 6:16), but Simon Cananites (Simon) the Zealot (Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13).'

<sup>26</sup> The Biblical names are given in their usual English spelling, other names in transcribed form as they are found in the Greek and Coptic texts. Important variant readings are mentioned in the discussion of the individual apostles that follows below. In the case of Ibn Kabar, the spellings of Hanna and Graf are literally reproduced, with those of Graf between square brackets (for no. 9, see p. 29). In the Greek text the apostles are numbered (also in Hanna's translation of Ibn Kabar, but it remains unclear whether this was already the case in his Arabic text). I have added the same numbers to the names in the non-Greek texts, so that their order in these texts can be easily seen.

<i>Greek Text</i>	<i>Ps. Cyril</i>	<i>Ps. John Chrys.</i>	<i>Ostraca</i>	<i>Ibn Kabar</i>
5 Philip father: Philisanōs mother: Sophia profess.: charioteer from: Bethsaida	5. Philip  father: charioteer	5. Philip  father: charioteer  Bethsaida	5. Philip  father: charioteer  Bethsaida	5. Philip Julianos Sariah animal trainer [Pferdezucht] Bethsaida
6 Thomas/ Didymus  father: Diaphanēs mother: Rhoa profess.: from:	6 Thomas  tender of the waterwheel Antioch	6 Thomas  tender of the waterwheel Antioch	6 Thomas  tender of the waterwheel Antioch	7 Thomas/ Didymus (twin brother of Lysia) Diwnanous  Rowaass  Jerusalem
7 Bartholomew  father: Sosthenes  mother: Ourania profess.: fruit seller/ grower of greens from:	7 Bartholomew  gardener/grower or seller of greens	7 Bartholomew  gardener/grower or seller of greens	7 Bartholomew  gardener/grower or seller of greens	6 Bartholomew / Joshua [Jašû'] Elsakher [Issachar] Armaneen gardener  Aphron [Afrûn]
8 Thaddaeus/ Lebbaeus  father: Nekrophanēs mother: Selēnē profess.: from: Italy	8 Thaddaeus  stonecutter or sculptor		8 Thaddaeus  stonecutter or sculptor <sup>27</sup>	10 Judas the son of James, identified with Liaos or Tadeos [Labbäus Thaddäus] Nakrios  Salans  Antioch
9 James the son of Alphaeus father: Andrōn mother: Eutychia profess.: sculptor or stone cutter from: Hierapolis	11 James the son of Alphaeus  tender of the waterwheel			9 James the son of Alphaeus Ūryās Askanā linen weaver or worker Sabastīyya [Sebaste] near Nablus

<sup>27</sup> The text published by Biedenkopf-Ziehner (see above note 23) ends here.

<i>Greek Text</i>	<i>Ps. Cyril</i>	<i>Ps. John Chrys.</i>	<i>Ostraca</i>	<i>Ibn Kabar</i>
10 Matthew/Levi father: Roukos mother: Chairotheia profess.: tax collector from: Galilee	9 Matthew  tax collector	8 Matthew		8 Matthew/Levi Darwsas Zarkwa  tax collector  Nazareth
11 Simon Cananites  father: Kalliōn mother: Kamia 'profess.': inviter of the Lord to the wedding  from: Cana	10 Simon  inviter to the wedding	9 Simon Cananites  inviter to the wedding		11 Simon Cananites, identified with Simon the Zealot Balinos, Philip Inatmen the one in whose house the wedding of Cana took place [der Bräutigam der Hochzeit] Cana
12 Simon Zelotes  father: Zenōn mother: ... [lost] profess.: ... [lost] from: Saleim				(= Simon Cananites)
Judas Iscariot (see pp. 15–16)	12 Judas Iscariot			
		10 Judas the son of James, twin brother of Lētia		
		11 James the Brother of the Lord father: Joseph profess.: carpenter		
	[Matthias Paul Mark]			12 Matthias [Paul Mark Luke]

Pseudo-Cyril, *On New Sunday*, mentions several of these professions, though without connecting them to a specific apostle. Speaking about the apostles' authorization to forgive or not to forgive any man's sins (John 20:23), he says: "These poor and simple men receive this great authority. These fishers, stonemasons, sellers of greens, inviters and tanners are lord over the entire world."<sup>28</sup> This author apparently knew a list which agreed in many respects with those reproduced above (stonemasons, sellers of greens, inviters), but also showed at least one deviation, as the profession of tanner (βακωδαρ = βυρσεύς) does not occur in the other texts.

A few remarks may be useful with respect to the specific information on the apostles presented by these lists.

1. 2. That the father of Peter and Andrew is called John in the Greek text and in Pseudo-John Chrysostom is obviously derived from the canonical Gospels. In John 1:42 and 21:15–19, Peter is addressed by Jesus as 'Simon, son of John' (Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου, Σίμων Ἰωάννου), though a number of manuscripts here read 'son of Jonah (Jonas)' (Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ). The latter reading, which seems to be presupposed in Ibn Kabar (Jouna), is, of course, influenced by Matthew 16:17, where Peter is addressed as 'Simon Barjonah' (Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ = 'son of Jonah'). The same confusion seems to have occurred with respect to the name of the mother of Peter and Andrew. In the manuscripts of the Greek list she is named Joannē ('Ἰωάννη), Joanna ('Ἰωάννα), Joannas ('Ἰωαννάς) and Jona ('Ἰωνᾶ), while she is called Joanna or Jonana in Ibn Kabar. The reading Ἰωνᾶ may have led to her remarkable name in the list of Pseudo-John Chrysostom: Barjona (βαριωνα). It is conceivable that a copyist found the name Jona in his manuscript and erroneously or deliberately changed it into the more familiar Barjona. That they were fishermen was well-known from the Gospels (Matthew 4:18–22, Mark 1:16–20, Luke 5:1–11, John 21:1–8) and that they came from Bethsaida (Greek text, Ostraca and Ibn Kabar) is found in John 1:45.

3. 4. That Zebedee was the father of James and John and that they were fishermen and came from Bethsaida (Greek text and Ibn Kabar) is to be found in the biblical texts just mentioned. In the Greek text, their mother is called Hierokleia, which seems to have been abbreviated to Hierokē in

<sup>28</sup> Pierpont Morgan Library M595, fol. 81v, p. ϣζα [164], a, 1–11 (Facs. ed., vol 43, 164): νερωμε ἡρηνκε αγω ἡρλιαωτης φαντογυατε ἡτηνοσ νεγκερια. νειογωρε ρι λατωης ρι σα ἡογοοτε ρι ρεφτωρῆ ρι βακωδαρ φαντογορε ροεισ ετοικογμνη τηρῆ.

Pseudo-John Chrysostom. The name Hierokleia seems to have been changed into Theokleia (Tâûklijjâ) in the manuscript of Ibn Kabar that was translated by Georg Graf. Hanna's translation of another manuscript reads Thaeophelia, which reflects the Greek name Theophilia.

5. The Greek text and Ibn Kabar are the only sources mentioning the names of Philip's parents, although they are not in agreement. According to the Greek list they were called Philisanos and Sophia, while Ibn Kabar, on the other hand, says that their names were Julianos and Sariah. They are not known from other sources. That Philip came from Bethsaida derives from John 1:45. The meaning of the name Philip (φίλιππος, 'horse-loving'; φιλιπεῖν, 'be fond of horses') obviously suggested the apostle's worldly profession. In most manuscripts of the Greek list, it is Philip himself who is said to have been a driver in the chariot races (ἡνίοχος τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα). Only one Greek manuscript (D, 13th century) reads ἡνίοχοι, implying that both he and his father were charioteers. The Coptic texts declare him to be the son of a chariot driver: Pseudo-Cyril: πρῶτο ἡφιλιππος οὐρεφωρῃ πε ρῃ παγων, 'the father (lit.: old man) of Philip was a charioteer in the races'; Pseudo-John Chrysostom: πωρε πε ἡογεμιοχος ἡτε παγων, 'he was the son of a charioteer in the races.' The text on the Coptic ostraca also suggests that it was Philip's father who was a charioteer: φιλιππος πωρε πε ἡογεμιοχος εφωρῃ ρῃ παγων, 'Philip was the son of a charioteer who drove in the races.'<sup>29</sup> That one of Jesus' disciples would have been an ordinary charioteer in the stadium was apparently found too shocking. It is of interest to note that the wording of the two Coptic homiletic texts is so different ('the old man of' / 'the son of'; the Greek word ἡνίοχος translated / not translated) that it is very unlikely that they are in some way dependent on each other. Ibn Kabar explains Philip's name ('one who loves horses' / 'Liebhaber der Pferde') and he also sees a relationship between his name and his profession though he does not mention the horse races. According to Hanna's translation, Ibn Kabar says of Philip and his father that 'their business was training animals' (apparently horses are meant), according to Graf it was horse breeding ('ihre Beschäftigung was Pferdezucht').

6. The parents of Thomas, Diaphanes and Rhoea, are mentioned in the Greek text and by Ibn Kabar, who made him the seventh apostle of his list. Both sources assert that Thomas was also called Didymus ('Twin'), which the

<sup>29</sup> See below p. 184; Appendix 1.3, with note 12 to the translation.

Greek text explains by saying that he had a twin sister called Lysia (Λυσία = Λυδία?). In Pseudo-John Chrysostom it is Judas the son of James who has a twin sister, named Lētia (Λητία, Λητία = Λυδία?). In all likelihood, there must be some relationship between these two statements, since the pronunciation of the names was nearly identical and Judas was also one of the names of Thomas (Thomas Didymus Judas).<sup>30</sup> The parents of Thomas are called Diaphanes and Rhoea in the Greek text and, according to Hanna's translation, Diwnanous and Rowaass in Ibn Kabar, which are obviously the same names. The statement of Pseudo-John Chrysostom and the ostraca that Thomas was of Antiochene origin is paralleled by the Greek list; according to Ibn Kabar, however, he came from Jerusalem. That he was a κυκλευτής (κυκλεῦτης or κεκλεῦτης) by profession is only found in the Coptic texts. The word κυκλευτής was part of the vocabulary of irrigation in Egypt and meant a 'tender of the water-wheel (κύκλευμα),' though in later Christian Greek it could also mean a 'vagrant monk.'<sup>31</sup> Since the professions mentioned in the list are real crafts which required professional skills (that of Simon Cananites being the only exception), it seems likely that the typically Egyptian occupation of 'tender of the water-wheel' is meant. Its occurrence in three Coptic lists which are not directly dependent on each other suggests that it was already to be found in their common source, which might have been another, more expanded version of the Greek list or a Coptic translation of that list. The Greek text as we know it and also Ibn Kabar do not assign any profession to Thomas, but it may be clear that it was only in Egypt that such a typically Egyptian occupation could be ascribed to the apostle Thomas.

7. According to the Greek text, the parents of Bartholomew were Sosthenes and Ourania. Ibn Kabar says that this apostle was also called Joshua (Jašū'). According to Graf's translation, the name of his father was 'Issachar aus Afrūn,' which in Hanna's translation is spelled 'Elsakher from Aphron.'<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> According to some (especially Syriac) traditions, Judas Thomas was the twin brother of Jesus, for instance in the *Acts of Thomas*, 39, where an ass-colt addresses Thomas as 'You twin of Christ, apostle of the Most High and initiate in the secret word of Christ, who receives his hidden words'; cfr. the prologue of the *Gospel of Thomas*: 'These are the secret words which the Living Jesus spoke and Didymus Judas Thomas wrote down.'

<sup>31</sup> Liddell & Scott, *Lexicon*, 1006a, s.v.; Lampe, *Lexicon*, 785a, s.v. The word was taken in the latter sense by M. Choat, 'Thomas the "Wanderer" in a Coptic List of the Apostles,' *Orientalia* 74 (2005), 83–85.

<sup>32</sup> According to Hanna, *The Lamp*, 70, n. 2, his manuscript had the word 'setaphos' written above the word 'elsakher.' According to a Syriac text on the apostles, Cod. Vat. Syr, 159, fol. 452', translated by Haase, *Apostel und Evangelisten*, 294, Bartholomew came from 'Ado'ir.



Hanna's manuscript also gave the name of Bartholomew's mother, Arma-  
neen. There is no mention of these names in any other known tradition on  
this apostle.

Bartholomew's profession demands a more ample discussion than those  
of the other apostles. In the Greek text he is said to have been a *πωμαρίτης*  
*ἤτοι λαχάνια φυτεύων*, 'a fruit grower/fruiterer or a grower of greens.' The  
word *πωμαρίτης* is derived from *πωμάριον*, 'orchard,' which in fact is the Latin  
word *pomarium*. It is one of a number of Latin words that had become  
common in Greek speaking Egypt, and there only.<sup>33</sup> The word *πωμαρίτης*  
(fem. *πωμαρίτισσα*), 'fruit grower, fruiterer,' is also only known from Greek  
papyri found in Egypt.<sup>34</sup> The use of this typically Egyptian-Greek word might  
be an indication that the Greek list originated in Egypt.

The Coptic lists, however, do not say that Bartholomew was a *πωμα-  
ρίτης*, but a *κομαρίτης* (*κωμάριτης*), a 'gardener.' In the Coptic documen-  
tary papyri, this word occurs several times in different spellings: *κωμα-  
ρίτης*, *κομαρίτης*, *κογμαρίτης*, *κωμαρι*, and *κωμαρ*.<sup>35</sup> Pseudo-Cyril says of  
Bartholomew: *ογκομαρίτης* *ἵσα ἡγοοῦτε πε*, and Pseudo-John Chrysostom

<sup>33</sup> S. Daris, *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*, 2nd ed., Barcelona: Seminari de Papirologia, 1991; I.-M. Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser unter Mitarbeit von J. [M.] Diethart, *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter in der griechischsprachigen dokumentarischen Texten Ägyptens mit Berücksichtigung koptischer Quellen* (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer), Neue Serie, 27. Folge, fasc. I and II (Alpha-Delta), Vienna: Hollinek, 1996, 2000. I am grateful to my colleague the papyrologist Klaas Worp, for some useful references to recent literature and the fruitful discussion we had about the words *πωμαρίτης* and *κομαρίτης*.

<sup>34</sup> In the *Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri*, which can be consulted at [www.Papyri.info](http://www.Papyri.info), the word *πωμαρίτης* is mentioned 41 times in 34 documents (*πωμαρίτισσα* only once); the earliest attestations are in Pap. Oxy. 36, 2781.5 (2nd century) and Pap. Oxy. 58, 3923.3 (3rd century); Liddell & Scott, *Lexicon*, 1561a s.v., translate the word as 'fruiterer,' but it is usually interpreted as 'fruit grower' or 'fruit gardener.'

<sup>35</sup> H. Förster, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten* (TU, 148), Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002, 457. Two other attestations are listed in M.P.M. Hasitzka (ed.), *Koptisches Sammelbuch*, Vol. III (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Herzog Rainer), Neue Serie, XXIII. Folge, Band 3), München-Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2006, 131, No. 1534, 6 (*ἐκκωμαρε*; graffito from the Osireion at Abydos; tenth century) and 153, No. 1609, 6–7 (*μακαρε πκωμαρίτης*; epitaph from Saqqara of uncertain date). On *κωμαριον* and *κωμαρίτης*, see also J. Diethart, 'Zum Beitrag koptischer Texte der byzantinischen Zeit zur griechischen und lateinischen Lexikographie,' in W. Hörandner, J. Koder & M.A. Stassinopoulou, *Wiener Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik. Beiträge zum Symposium vierzig Jahre Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien, im Gedenken an Herbert Hunger (Wien, 4–7 Dezember 2002)* (Byzantina et Neograeca Vindobonensia, XXIV), Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004, 138–140.

and the text on the ostrakon published by Biedenkopf-Ziehner use the same words: ογκομαρίτης πὲ ἱκα ογοοτε, which in both cases means ‘a gardener, a grower (or: seller) of greens.’<sup>36</sup> The same expression is found in the section on Bartholomew in an only fragmentarily preserved *Historia Sacra*, which deals with the vicissitudes of a great number of biblical characters. On p. 181b, lines 5–8 of the codex containing this *Historia*, which is kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Fonds Copte 129<sup>18</sup> fol. 96<sup>10</sup> b, 5–8), it is said: βαρθολομαίος ογκομαρίτης πὲ ἱκα ἡγοοτε.<sup>37</sup> Ibn Kabar simply says that Bartholomew was ‘a gardener’ (Graf: ‘Gärtner in den Garten’). In the *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Bartholomew the Apostle*, 58,<sup>38</sup> Bartholomew says that people will ask: ‘Is not this Bartholomew, [Ms. C adds: the man of Italy],<sup>39</sup> the gardener (κομαρίτης) [Ms. C adds: the grower (or: seller) of greens (ἱκα [ἡογ]οοτε)]. Is this not the one who is in the garden (κομαρίον) of Hierōkatēs,<sup>40</sup> the governor of our city, who sells greens (εφτ ογοοτε εβολ) which we buy?’ As can be seen from this text, a κομαρίτης (χωμαρίτης, ‘gardener’) is someone who works in a κομαρίον (χωμαρίον, ‘garden’). According to one of the many ‘Cyrillian interpolations’ (from Egypt, fifth century) in the *Lexicon* of Hesychius of Alexandria, χωμαρίον was another

<sup>36</sup> Pleše, in Depuydt, *Homiletica*, 79, seems to take χωμαρίτης as referring to a place name: ‘a Komaritan herb-seller,’ which is certainly wrong.

<sup>37</sup> For the remains of this codex (in Vienna, Paris, London, Michigan, Cairo, Naples), see Paola Buzi, *Catalogo dei manoscritti copti Borgia conservati presso la Biblioteca Nazionale “Vittorio Emanuele III” di Napoli, con un profilo scientifico di Stefano Borgia e Georg Zoega e una breve storia della formazione della collezione Borgiana* (Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Anno CDVI—2009, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Memorie, Serie IX, vol. 25, fasc. 1, Roma: Scienze e Lettere, 2009), 296 (ad IB14.44–47). O. von Lemm, ‘Kleine koptische Studien, XXV,’ in *Bulletin de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg*, XIV, 3 (1901) 304 (reprinted in idem, *Kleine koptische Studien*, Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1972, 212), was the first to draw attention to this text.

<sup>38</sup> The division of the text into chapters follows that of the edition by M. Westerhoff, *Auferstehung und Jenseits im koptischen “Buch der Auferstehung Jesu Christi, unseres Herrn”* (Orientalia Biblica et Christiana, 11), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999, 151. French translation and notes in J.-D. Kaestli & P. Cherix, *L’Évangile de Barthélémy d’après deux écrits apocryphes: I. Questions de Barthélémy, II. Livre de la Résurrection de Jésus-Christ par l’apôtre Barthélémy*, Turnhout: Brepols, 1993, 219 (they apparently did not know (pp. 161–162) that the tradition of Bartholomew as a gardener was quite common in Coptic literature).

<sup>39</sup> The manuscript reads: ηρῖθηαλια; cf. Kaestli & Cherix, *L’Évangile*, 219, n. 149: ‘On ne voit pas comment expliquer cette indication saugrenue et complètement isolée. Un toponyme inconnu se cache-t-il derrière de copte *rmtithalia* (“l’homme de Tithalia”)?’ In the Greek list it is Thaddaeus / Lebbaeus who is from Italy.

<sup>40</sup> The name is very unusual and unattested. It may originally have been Hierokles, ηιεροκλῆς, which was erroneously copied as ηιεροκαλῆς (λ read as α), which later on was ‘corrected’ into ηιεροκατῆς (suggestion K.A. Worp).

word for ἀγρίδιον, a diminutive of ἀγρός, ‘field, tilled land,’ and of χωρίον, which was used in connection with ἀγρός and *int. al.* means ‘landed property.’<sup>41</sup> The word κωμάριον seems to have been a typically Egyptian Greek word. It is not found in the Greek papyri, but in the Coptic documentary papyri it occurs in the form of κωμαρι,<sup>42</sup> and in Coptic literary texts the complete Greek word is used: κομαριον or κωμαριον. The Copts may have sensed a connection with the Coptic word ⲥωⲙ, ‘garden,’ ‘vineyard,’ ‘property,’ it is even conceivable that the Greek form developed on the basis of the Coptic word.<sup>43</sup> Its general meaning is ‘garden’ or, if required by the context, ‘orchard.’ It was nearly synonymous with κήπος, ‘garden, orchard,’ albeit that the Copts apparently felt some difference between the two words. In an *Encomium on Theodore the General, the Anatolian*, attributed to Theodore of Antioch, it is said of a certain Samar that he possessed ϣ̅ⲏⲕⲏⲡⲟⲥ (κήποι), ϣ̅ⲏⲙⲁ ⲛ̅ⲉⲕⲟⲟⲗⲉ (‘vineyards’), and ϣ̅ⲏⲕⲟⲙⲁⲣⲓⲟⲛ (κωμάριον).<sup>44</sup> It is difficult to say how the first and the last word have to be translated: in both cases ‘garden’ and ‘orchard’ are possible. The man who cultivated the land, the grower of fruit and vegetables, or the man who takes care of a garden or an orchard, was called a κωμάριτης (κο/ωμαριτης). It is of interest to note that in Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Resurrection and the Passion*, the word ‘gardener’ (κηπουρός) of John 20:15 is not rendered by the word πατεωρη, lit. ‘the man of the garden,’ in accordance with the standard Sahidic Bible translation, but by πκωμαριτης ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲱⲛⲏ, ‘the gardener of the garden.’<sup>45</sup> That κομαριτης and κηπουρός had the same meaning also appears from Pseudo-Cyril, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 36, which in the same context speaks of the

<sup>41</sup> K. Latte (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, I, Hauniae: Munksgaard, 1953, 30: ἀγρίδιον-κωμάριον, χωρίον; cf. Liddell & Scott, *Lexicon*, 1017b, s.v. κωμαρίον, and 2016a, s.v. χωρίον. On the Cyrillian glosses, see Latte, XLIV.

<sup>42</sup> Förster, *Wörterbuch*, 456/457, ‘kleiner Garten.’ Diethart, ‘Zum Beitrag koptischer Texte,’ 138–139, also mentions the forms κογμαρι (without reference).

<sup>43</sup> The close relationship between ⲥωⲙ and κωμαριον was already pointed out by Von Lemm, ‘Kleine koptische Studien, XXV,’ 301–305 (reprint 1972, 209–213); see also Crum, *Dictionary*, 817b s.v. ⲥωⲙ, and Diethart, ‘Zum Beitrag koptischer Texte,’ 139–140, who derives κωμαριον from ⲥωⲙ and points out that, just as in the case of πο/ωμάριον—πο/ωμαριτης, the word κω/ωμαριον quite naturally led to formation of κω/ωμαριτης.

<sup>44</sup> Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts*, 7 (text), 583 (transl.: ‘gardens, and vineyards, and orchards’).

<sup>45</sup> Pierpont Morgan Library M595, fol. 24<sup>vo</sup> (p. 48) a, 29–30; unedited, Facs. ed., vol. 43, 50 (on this text, see pp. 81–87 below). For the standard Sahidic translation of John 20:15, see G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*, vol. III: *The Gospel of John*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911 (reprint Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1969), 314.

κηπορος (= κηπουρός) ἡτῶν, ‘the gardener of the garden.’<sup>46</sup> The evidence presented here leaves no doubt that the κωμάριτης was a grower of fruit or vegetables or at least someone who worked in a garden or an orchard, whereas the πωμαρίτης was a fruit grower and seller. This implies that the two words were interchangeable to a certain extent, though κωμάριτης had a broader meaning: every fruit grower (πωμαρίτης) could be called a gardener (κωμάριτης), but a κωμάριτης could also be a grower of vegetables. Under small-scale agricultural circumstances it is to be expected that the grower of fruit was also a grower of vegetables, and also that he sold his own products.

According to the Greek text, Bartholomew was a πωμαρίτης ἦτοι λαχάνια φυτεύων, ‘a fruit grower/seller or a grower of greens.’ In the Coptic texts, the word κομαριτης is followed by a mediated attributive, expressing, *int. al.*, occupation and introduced by ḥ: <sup>47</sup> ḥca ḥoḥoote or ḥca oḥoote. The word ca + (usually) ḥ means ‘man of,’ ‘maker of,’ ‘dealer in’; therefore, a ca ḥoḥoote is ‘a grower/seller of greens, a gardener who grows vegetables and sells them.’<sup>48</sup> The Coptic expression corresponds with the λαχάνια φυτεύων of the Greek list. It seems that the word κομαριτης is specified by ḥca ḥoḥoote: Bartholomew was ‘a gardener, namely a grower and seller of greens.’ If this was the original description of Bartholomew’s profession, we have to consider the possibility that, at least at this point, the priority belongs to the Coptic version and that the Greek translator deliberately substituted the more common word πωμαρίτης for the apparently more unfamiliar κωμάριτης. In this way, the words λαχάνια φυτεύων, ‘grower of vegetables,’ came to indicate an alternative profession in the Greek text, instead of an specification of the more general word ‘gardener.’

The term ca ḥoḥoote was primarily interpreted as ‘seller of greens,’ especially when following the word κομαριτης. This already became apparent in the *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Bartholomew the Apostle*, 58, quoted above. In a Bohairic *Homily on the Wedding at Cana*,<sup>49</sup> the

<sup>46</sup> Ed. A. Campagnano, *Ps. Cirillo di Gerusalemme: Omelie copte sulla Passione, sulla Croce e sulla Vergine* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell’ Antichità, LXV), Milano: Cisalpino—Goliardica, 1980, 48/49 (called *Sulla passione a* by Campagnano, see on this text pp. 77–79).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, 82 (§99).

<sup>48</sup> Crum, *Dictionary*, 316a s.v. ca; Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, 88 (§109, where the word is erroneously spelled 6a); also Crum, *Dictionary*, 493b s.v. oḥo(o)te (‘herb-seller, gardener’). The word ca ḥoḥoote is also used in Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem’s *On New Sunday* to indicate the craft of an unspecified apostle, apparently Bartholomew; see p. 19, n. 28.

<sup>49</sup> Edited by H. de Vis, *Homélies coptes de la Vaticane. Texte copte publié et traduit* (Coptica I), Hauniae: Gyldendalske Boghandel-Nordisk Forlag, 1922, 53–106.

Alexandrian Patriarch Benjamin (620–659) says of each disciple why he was invited to the wedding:

Bartholomew was invited because he was first a gardener, a seller of greens (οὔκομαρτης πρὸς ἡμεῖς ἡγοῦτο), who sold greens (ἐκτὶ οὔρο) to everyone who liked to have them, and proclaimed to the whole wedding party or rather to the whole world: ‘I have stopped selling greens. From now on I am selling the word of God to those who like to have it, and I sell it for nothing.’<sup>50</sup>

There is no reason whatsoever to doubt the authenticity of this homily. The author tells two stories that are in perfect agreement with everything we know of Patriarch Benjamin and his time.<sup>51</sup> This means that the tradition that Bartholomew had been a seller of greens was already known in the middle of the seventh century, and probably earlier, since Benjamin speaks about it as a generally known fact. However, this does not imply that in his time the whole list of worldly occupations of the apostles was already established. Benjamin mentions the disciples Peter, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, Taddaeus, Simon Cananites, and Judas, mentioning about all of them why they were invited to the wedding and, in most cases, what they preached to the wedding party and to the whole world. But apart from Bartholomew, Matthew is the only one of the Twelve who says something about his former profession, obviously based on the information in his own Gospel (9:9; 10:3): ‘Matthew was invited in order to proclaim to the whole wedding party: “I was a tax collector, I have become an Evangelist.”’<sup>52</sup> Even the fact that the first four disciples had been fishermen who had become ‘fishers of men’ (Matthew 4:8ff.) is not mentioned at all. The same phenomenon can be observed in the short descriptions of the apostles that are found in the

<sup>50</sup> De Vis, *Homélie coptes*, pp. 61–62. De Vis’s translation reads: ‘Barthélemy fut invité, parce que depuis le commencement il était cultivateur de légumes, vendant les légumes à celui qui le voulait, et il enseignait au festin nuptial entier, ou plutôt au monde entier: “J’ai cessé de vendre des légumes depuis cette heure: j’ai donné (ἀτ) la parole de Dieu à celui qui le voulait et je l’ai donnée (ἐτ) gratuitement.”’ I don’t take ἀτ as a past (perfect) tense, as De Vis apparently did, but as a second present (durative) tense; cf. the Bohairic grammar of A. Mallon, *Grammaire copte. Bibliographie, chrestomathie et vocabulaire*, 4<sup>ème</sup> éd., revue par M. Malinine, Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1956, 110 (§ 237, 2).

<sup>51</sup> See De Vis, *Homélie coptes*, 53–55, and in particular C.D.G. Müller, *Die alte koptische Predigt (Versuch eines Überblicks)*, Thesis Ruprecht-Karl University Heidelberg, 1954, 22–23 and 39–49 (p. 22: written about AD 642. ‘Wir haben hier somit den seltsamen Fall vor uns, daß wir eine koptische Homilie ohne Vorbehalte einem bestimmten Verfasser zuschreiben können’).

<sup>52</sup> De Vis, *Homélie coptes*, 62.

already mentioned manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Fonds Copte 129<sup>18</sup> fol. 95–97):<sup>53</sup> there, too, Bartholomew is the only apostle whose worldly profession is mentioned. It seems, therefore, that in the case of Bartholomew we are concerned with a separate, rather early and typically Egyptian tradition, which later on became incorporated into a list of the worldly occupations of all the disciples.<sup>54</sup> The reason why this specific profession was attributed to Bartholomew is unknown.<sup>55</sup>

8. In the Greek list, Thaddaeus is identified with Lebbaeus: Θαδδαῖος ὁ καὶ Λεββαῖος, which was rather common in the apocryphal traditions on the apostles, *int. al.* in the *Acta Thaddaei*, 1: Λεββαῖος ὁ καὶ Θαδδαῖος.<sup>56</sup> In the list of Pseudo-John Chrysostom, Thaddaeus / Lebbaeus is not mentioned, which might be explained by the fact that he was also often identified with Judas the son of James, whose name appears towards the end of this list.<sup>57</sup> Ibn Kabar mentions Judas the son of James as the tenth apostle and then identifies him with Lebbaeus (Hanna's translation: Liaos) / Thaddaeus.<sup>58</sup> According to the *Acta Thaddaei*, 1, he came from Edessa, whereas the Greek list says that he was an Italian (Ἰταλικός), while Ibn Kabar asserts that he

<sup>53</sup> See p. 23 above.

<sup>54</sup> According to a different Coptic tradition, Peter sold Bartholomew as a slave in order to enable him to preach the Gospel in an oasis. He worked in a vineyard and each time he led the vine branches they immediately bore fruit; see De Vis, *Homélie coptes*, 61, n. 2, who *int. al.* refers to R. Basset (ed.), *Le Synaxaire arabe jacobite (réduction copte)* (PO 1, 3), Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907, 224–225; see also the circumstantial account in an extensive Arabic, but originally Coptic, work on the apostles, translated by Agnes Smith Lewis, *The Mythological Acts of the Apostles* (Horae Semiticae, IV), London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1904, 69–75 (edited by eadem in *Horae semiticae* III, *ibid.*, 1904). The same tradition is hinted at in the fragment of the Coptic *Historia Sacra* (see p. 23) in Paris (BN Copte 129<sup>18</sup>, fol. 96<sup>ro</sup> (p. 181) b, 22–29).

<sup>55</sup> M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953 (corrected 1924 edition), 186, surmised that Bartholomew's profession was suggested by his identification with Nathanael, who was 'under the fig-tree' (John 1:48), which might have been enough to make him a gardener. The same suggestion (without reference to James) in Kaestli & Cherix, *L'Évangile de Barthélemy*, 162. But that does not explain why he was thought to be a dealer in vegetables.

<sup>56</sup> Edited by R.A. Lipsius, in *idem & M. Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, I, Leipzig: H. Mendelssohn, 1891 (reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959, 273). In Matthew 10:3 and Mark 3:18, many Bible manuscripts read Lebbaeus instead of Thaddaeus.

<sup>57</sup> See Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden*, 282–283; see also the addition to the Greek list, mentioned above, p. 16, n. 25.

<sup>58</sup> At the end of his discussion of Judas the son of James, Ibn Kabar notes that 'Luke called him the Brother of the Lord in his Gospel and in the Book of Acts. Mark and Matthew called him Taddaeus and Labbaeus.'

came from Antioch (in Graf's translation: 'aus der Stadt Antālijja'). These data are not found in any other known text, and the same holds for the names of his parents, which were Nekrophanes and Selene according to the Greek text and Nakrios and Salans according to Ibn Kabar (Hanna's translation). Nakrios may be a corrupted form of Necrophanes, but Salans is certainly the same name as Selene, as appears from Ibn Kabar's additional explanation: 'the interpretation of her name is "quamar," moon' (Greek: Σελήνη).

The Greek text does not ascribe a specific craft to Thaddaeus, nor does Ibn Kabar, but Pseudo-Cyril says that he was οὐρεφκερκωρ ωνε, 'a stonecutter,' which can be the translation of the Greek words λατόμος and λιθουργός.<sup>59</sup> The ostracon published by Biedenkopf-Ziehner uses the word λατόμος, immediately explained by its Coptic equivalent: ογλατωμος πε ηρεφκερε ωνε. In Pseudo-Cyril's *On New Sunday*, the word λατωμῆς (λατόμος) is used to indicate the craft of one of the apostles.<sup>60</sup> However, in the Greek text it is James the son of Alphaeus who is said to have been a λαοζόος τὴν τέχνην, 'a stonecutter (or sculptor) by profession,'<sup>61</sup> which might have been the original version. It is conceivable that already the common source of Pseudo-Cyril and the text on the ostracon erroneously assigned the craft that originally belonged to James the son of Alphaeus to Thaddaeus, which resulted in the omission of the former's name. Pseudo-Cyril's text suggests that this fault was corrected at the end of the list, by inserting James the son of Alphaeus before Judas Isacariot and assigning to him the same occupation as that ascribed to Thomas (κεκλεγτης, 'tender of the waterwheel').

9. James the son of Alphaeus was often identified with James the Brother of the Lord,<sup>62</sup> which may be the reason why Pseudo-John Chrysostom left out the son of Alphaeus and added the Brother of the Lord as No. 10 at the end of his list. The information provided by the Greek list on the parents of James of Alphaeus, Andron and Eutychia, and the place he came from, Hierapolis,

<sup>59</sup> See Crum, *Dictionary*, 133a, s.v. ρεφκερκῆ and καρεκῆ.

<sup>60</sup> See p. 19, n. 28.

<sup>61</sup> The relationship between the words λαοζόος, 'sculptor,' and λαοξός, 'stonecutter' (cf. Liddell & Scott, *Lexicon*, 1029 s.v.; E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from BC146 to AD1100)*, New York: F. Ungar, 1957 [= Cambridge, Mass.-London: Harvard University Press-Oxford University Press, 1887 and 1914], vol. II, 705b, however, gives for λαοξός 'stone-cutter') is so close that we need not assume that Pseudo-Cyrril deliberately corrected his source by making Thaddaeus a stonecutter instead of a sculptor.

<sup>62</sup> Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden*, 278–280.

is not found elsewhere. According to Ibn Kabar, he came 'from the tribe of Manassā from Sabastīyya near Nābulus. His father's name is Ūryās and his mother's name Askanā. His profession was the work of al-kattān.'<sup>63</sup> The last word implies that James 'worked with garments made of linen, or perhaps with the raw material flax/linen itself.'<sup>64</sup>

The Greek text, however, says that James the son of Alphaeus was a λαοξόος τὴν τέχνην, 'a stonecutter (or sculptor) by profession,' and this may also have been said in Pseudo-Cyril's source (see under No. 8).

10. That Matthew was also called Levi, as the Greek list and Ibn Kabar (who mentions him as No. 8) explicitly say, and that he was a tax collector, as is also stated by Pseudo-Cyril, was of course derived from the Gospels (Mark 2:14 and Luke 5:27, compared with Matthew 9:9). That he came from Galilee (Greek text) follows from the same texts; the view that his town was Nazareth (Ibn Kabar) has no scriptural basis.<sup>65</sup> The Greek text and Ibn Kabar disagree about the names of his parents: the former calls them Rhoukos (Ms. D: Rhakos) and Chairotheia, but the latter speaks of Darwsas and Zarkwa. None of these names is known from other sources.

11. Simon Cananites, or 'Simon from Cana,' was often identified with Simon the Zealot,<sup>66</sup> as we also find in Ibn Kabar: 'he is called the Zealot.' The same author says about his parents, according to Hanna's translation: 'His father's name is Balinos and his mother's name is Inatmen,' but later on in this confused section on Simon (after a large digression about Nathanael) it is said that the name of his father was Philip (also in Graf's translation). However, Ibn Kabar also says that Simon's name was initially Dalīmā ibn Bûhân (Graf) or Dakima ibn Youkhan (thus Hanna). The Greek text, however, calls his

---

<sup>63</sup> I owe this translation to my colleague Christian Lange, professor of Arabic and Islamic Studies at the University of Utrecht, who kindly translated for me the passage on James from the edition by S.Kh. Samir (ed.), *Ibn Kabar, Abu-al-Barakat, Misbah al-zulma fi idah al-khidma*, vol. I, Cairo: Maktabat al-Karuz, 1971, 80–81. Hannah's translation is rather mysterious about James' profession, *The Lamp*, 71: 'His father's name is Oriass, and his mother's name is Eskina and his profession is the making of jut 'kittan' (sic!).'

<sup>64</sup> Thus Christian Lange in an e-mail of November 8, 2011; see M. Ullmann, *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache*, vol I, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970, 54–55 s.v. kattānūn: 'flax, linen, garment made of linen.'

<sup>65</sup> That Matthew came from the city of Nazareth is also found in several Syriac authors; according to Pseudo-Epiphanius he came from Jerusalem; see Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden*, 276.

<sup>66</sup> Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden*, 280 f.



parents Kallion (or Gallion) and Kamina (or Ammia), which seems to represent quite another tradition. He is called in one manuscript of the Greek text (B = Paris. 1115, from the year 1276) ἀριστοκλήτωρ τοῦ κυρίου εἰς τοὺς γάμους, 'the noble inviter of the Lord to the wedding.'<sup>67</sup> The suggestion seems to be that Simon was the host of Jesus at the wedding of Cana (John 2:1–12). Ibn Kabar says, according to Graf's translation, that he was the bridegroom ('er ist der Bräutigam der Hochzeit'), whereas Hanna's translation reads: 'he is the one in his (sic!, = whose) house the wedding of Cana took place.' Instead of the word ἀριστοκλήτωρ, other Greek manuscripts read ἀριστόκλητος, 'the best invitee of the Lord to the wedding,' which does not make much sense in this connection, though Schermann took it to be the original reading. The Coptic texts call Simon 'an inviter to the wedding' (ⲟⲩⲣⲉⲩⲧⲱⲭⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲛⲱⲉⲗⲉⲉⲧ) and have dropped the words 'of the Lord,' which might imply that Simon's isolated invitation has been changed into his usual occupation. It seems more likely, however, that also in this case the wedding of Cana was meant. Pseudo-Cyril's *On New Sunday* also mentions ρⲉⲩⲧⲱⲭⲓ, 'inviter,' as one of the occupations of the apostles.<sup>68</sup>

12. The numbered Greek list mentions Simon Zelotes as the twelfth apostle, stating that he came from Salim and that his father's name was Zenon. The text then breaks off in all manuscripts, although some of them add the name of Judas Iscariot.<sup>69</sup> Judas is also mentioned in Pseudo-Cyril, but left out in the other texts. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, who was silent about Thaddaeus / Lebbaeus and James the son of Alphaeus, adds Judas the son of James and James the Brother of the Lord as nos. 10 and 11 to his list. Ibn Kabar mentions Matthias, who was elected in the place of Judas (Acts 1:26), as the twelfth apostle (thus in the manuscript translated by Hanna; Graf's translation stops with Simon Cananites / Zelotes). At the beginning of this section, it was already pointed out that Pseudo-Cyril's source also contained the names of Matthias, Paul and Mark, which points to a rather late stage of the traditions on the apostles. There was a tendency to include Mark and Luke, the two Evangelists who had not been disciples of Jesus, into the college of the apostles, by assuming that they had been appointed by respectively Peter and Paul before the martyrdom of these apostles.

<sup>67</sup> The plural form (τοὺς γάμους) should be taken here as referring to a single wedding feast (that of Cana), as is often the case, e.g. Matthew 22:2; cf. Liddell & Scott, 337b, s.v.

<sup>68</sup> See p. 19, n. 28.

<sup>69</sup> See pp. 15–16.

This tradition is also transmitted by Ibn Kabar in an appendix to his discussion of the twelve apostles.

The material presented above leads to the following conclusions about the relationship between the five texts that contain the list of the apostles and about the origin of this list. Pseudo-Cyril does not give the names of the parents or those of the birthplaces of the apostles. A comparison with the other texts shows that the author or his source has considerably abridged the text that formed the basis of his account. Pseudo-Cyril's information on the worldly professions of Philip, Bartholomew and Simon Cananites agrees to a great extent with the information found in the other three texts. Simon is described as the one who invited Jesus to the wedding of Cana; according to Ibn Kabar, he was himself the bridegroom. It is conceivable that Simon's supposed connection with Cana led several authors independently to the 'profession' they ascribed to him, but the occupations of Bartholomew and Philip cannot be explained by some biblical motif. As in Pseudo-John Chrysostom and the text on the ostraca, Philip is called the son of a charioteer, whereas the Greek text says that he was a charioteer himself and Ibn Kabar that he was a horse breeder or horse trainer. Philip's profession was obviously inferred from the meaning of his name, but that the Greek and the three Coptic texts explicitly ascribe to him or his father the profession of a charioteer (the word ἡνιόχος is preserved in Pseudo-John Chrysostom and on the ostraca) cannot be accidental and points to a common source. In this case, the priority most probably belongs to the Greek text, for the idea that Philip was the son of a charioteer, as the Coptic texts say, is less offensive than that he was a chariot driver in the races himself. Bartholomew is said to have been a gardener, a grower or seller of greens, which we encountered in several Coptic texts as a generally known fact, without any connection with the occupations of the other apostles. Ibn Kabar only says that he was a gardener and does not speak about the growing or selling of vegetables. The Greek text also makes him a grower of greens, but instead of the word 'gardener' (in Coptic κομαρίτης) it has the typically Egyptian-Greek word for 'fruit seller' (πωμαρίτης). In view of the Coptic evidence, this seems a secondary development, caused by the unfamiliarity of the Coptic word for 'gardener.' This implies that at least the tradition about Bartholomew most probably had its origin within Coptic Christianity. There is no need, however, to suppose that the same holds for the entire list of the parents, birthplaces and professions of the apostles. As said above, the tradition of Bartholomew as a gardener and seller of greens was already known to Benjamin of Alexandria in the middle of the seventh century, but he does not reveal any knowledge of similar biographical details about the other

apostles, which, as a matter of fact, would have been very useful in the context of his homily. In view of what we know about the development of apocryphal traditions concerning the apostles in Byzantine and oriental literature, it is very unlikely that list discussed above was already in existence before the eighth century.

Apart from the occupations of Philip, Bartholomew and Simon Cananites, Pseudo-Cyril mentions two other worldly professions that deserve some attention here, namely those of Thomas, Thaddaeus and James the son of Alphaeus. Thomas is said to have been a tender of the waterwheel (κυκλευτής, κеклеγτης), a typically Egyptian occupation. The same profession is ascribed to him by Pseudo-John Chrysostom and the ostracon published by Biedenkopf-Ziehner, but it is not mentioned in the Greek text or by Ibn Kabar (at least in the two translations of different manuscripts that are available). For that reason it is impossible to say whether this was an exclusively Coptic tradition or also known in Greek speaking Egypt, though there can be no doubt that this tradition originated on Egyptian soil. In Pseudo-Cyril, the same occupation is attributed to James the son of Alphaeus, but it seems probable that this was due to a mistake which already occurred in his source, as argued above. In the Greek text, James the son of Alphaeus is said to have been a stonecutter or sculptor, but Pseudo-Cyril and the text on the ostracon published by Biedenkopf-Ziehner ascribe this craft to Thaddaeus. Most probably, James was erroneously omitted and this fault was corrected by inserting this apostle at the end of the list, just before Judas Isacariot, and by making him a tender of the waterwheel too. We may be quite certain that in this case, too, the priority belongs to the Greek text.

Pseudo-Cyril agrees with Pseudo-John Chrysostom and the text on the ostraca with respect to the occupations of Philip (father: charioteer), Thomas (tender of the waterwheel), Bartholomew (gardener, grower/seller of greens); the two homilistic texts also agree with respect to Simon Cananites (inviter to the wedding). With the exception of Thomas' profession, these crafts are also, with some minor variants, mentioned in the Greek text and by Ibn Kabar. Notwithstanding their agreements, the three Coptic texts are in no way dependent on each other, as only a superficial comparison of their texts convincingly shows. Contrary to Pseudo-Cyril, Pseudo-John Chrysostom also mentions the names of the mothers of the two pairs of brothers, Peter and Andrew and James and John. Even though the names are not exactly the same, there is no doubt that they derive from the same tradition as is to be found in the Greek text and Ibn Kabar.

The Greek text and Ibn Kabar present the most detailed information about both the parents, the worldly professions, and the birthplaces of the

apostles. They obviously reflect the same tradition and at least partly derive from a common source, but the differences between them are so great that it is inconceivable that Ibn Kabara is directly dependent on the Greek text. The two texts agree to a great extent with respect to the parents of Peter and Andrew, John and James, Thomas, and Thaddaeus / Lebbaeus, but they disagree with respect to the parents of Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, and Simon Cananites. It seems that Ibn Kabar, who transmits various Coptic traditions, also had access to other, related sources about the apostles. How far the agreements and the disagreements between the Greek text and Ibn Kabar really go will only become clear after the publication of a proper scholarly edition of Ibn Kabar's *Lamp of Darkness*. Before that, all remarks on the readings of this text can only be of a provisional character, as are those made above.

It seems justified to conclude from the discussion above that the Greek text originated in Egypt and was used in its present or, more probable, a related form (perhaps in a Coptic translation) by Pseudo-Cyril and Pseudo-John Chrysostom in their Coptic homilies and by the scribes of the ostraca. However, the priority of the Greek text does not exclude that it was itself influenced by typically Coptic traditions, e.g. that Bartholomew was a grower of greens. The peculiar traditions about the parents, the professions and the birth-places of the apostles, which are not found in any other Greek or oriental text, must have had a further independent development within Egyptian Christianity, as can be concluded from the *Lamp of Darkness* by Ibn Kabar. The Greek text can hardly be older than the eighth, perhaps even the ninth century.

### 3. *An Apocryphal Work on Pilate*

Pseudo-Cyril's presentation of the passion of Jesus shows beyond any doubt that his basic source was not, as he claims, an early apostolic writing but a late apocryphal work on Pilate. This apocryphon seems to have combined several traditions concerning the governor which until now were only separately known.<sup>70</sup> It is, of course, conceivable that Pseudo-Cyril had several

---

<sup>70</sup> The main sources of the apocryphal traditions on Pilate are to be found in C. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 2nd ed., Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1876, reprint Hildesheim: Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966, 210–486; also, with Spanish translation, in A. de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios Apócrifos*, Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 1956, 418–569. English translations and summaries in M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press,

writings on Pilate at his disposal, but it would seem that the combination of various data from these writings into a coherent story surpassed his abilities. Therefore, it is more probable that he based himself on a work in which these data had already been brought together.

This source must be responsible for the lengthy passage on the trial of Jesus before Pilate and Herod and the dreams of Pilate and his wife Procla (§§ 111–153). Its very positive view of Pilate points to an Egyptian origin, for only in the Coptic and Ethiopian Church has Pilate become a saint.<sup>71</sup> A Greek original of the whole passage is very unlikely, though there are some agreements with independent Greek writings on Pilate. The dream of Procla (§§ 141–143) foretold that Pilate would be beheaded and that she would see him in the glory of heaven and thereupon die herself and be buried with him (§ 152). This presupposes the closing passage of the so-called *Paradosis of Pilate*.<sup>72</sup> It will be shown below that there is also a close connection between Pseudo-Cyril's uncanonical chronology of Holy Week and another document of the Pilate cycle, the *Story of Joseph of Arimathea*.<sup>73</sup> Until now, we only knew of an exchange of letters between Pilate and Herod after the resurrection of Christ,<sup>74</sup> in which they both deplore having crucified him and Pilate confesses his belief in the risen Christ. Pseudo-Cyril transmits two other letters, written by them in connection with the sending of Jesus to Herod before the crucifixion (§§ 119, 122–124). These letters may be due to Pseudo-Cyril himself, since they simply presuppose the canonical Gospels. It is, however, often difficult to distinguish between what is due to Pseudo-Cyril's own invention and what was borrowed from his main source. Sometimes there seem to be insertions from other sources. One of them might be found after the peculiar story about the meal served to Pilate and Jesus by a boy of about ten years old in the dining-room of the palace

---

1953 (corrected 1924 edition), 94–165, and J.K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament. A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 164–225.

<sup>71</sup> The Ethiopian Church commemorates Pilate on the 25th of June, called 'Saint Pilate and Saint Procla's Day'; the Eastern Orthodox churches celebrate the 27th of October as 'Saint Procla's Day.'

<sup>72</sup> *Paradosis of Pilate*, 10 (ed. Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 455; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 526); see p. 177, n. 177.

<sup>73</sup> See p. 46.

<sup>74</sup> Edited by M.R. James, *Apocrypha anecdota*, II (Texts and Studies, 5, 1), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897, 66–70; also in de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 514–520; English translation in M.R. James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 155–156, and Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 222–224.

(§§ 130, 132, 135). The story ends with the words ‘After that they lay down,’ after which the text continues with a repetition of what had already been said in § 132 (§ 136) and with a demonstration of Jesus’ actual incorporeality which causes Pilate to faint (§ 137). Again, this seems an addition by the author to his source, who then continues with his main story: ‘And Pilate slept immediately and he saw a vision’ (§ 138). As far as I know, the dreams of Pilate and Procla are not found elsewhere (§§ 138–143). In Pilate’s dream Christ appears in the form of an eagle.<sup>75</sup> It came down from heaven to a dark and blind world, with a ‘cistern of light’ around it and a wreath on its head. It cried out: ‘The light of Charan and the light of Canaan have been given to the land of Egypt’ (§ 139). The Egyptians accepted it but the Hebrews remained blind and, therefore, killed it on a fruitless tree. However, the eagle lived again and flew back to heaven. The interpretation of this dream, as given by Jesus himself (§§ 146–151), contains several points which correspond only in a remote way to Pilate’s vision. The light which shone on the eagle (i.e. the ‘cistern of light’) is interpreted as the three hours of light during the crucifixion of Jesus, the wreath which the eagle had on its head when it came down from heaven is said to be the crown of thorns worn by Jesus on the cross, the cry of the eagle at his arrival is connected with Jesus’ last word on the cross. It seems that the author of Pseudo-Cyril’s source did not invent the dream himself but that he derived it from another context, which originally may have had no connection with Pilate at all. In Procla’s dream it is Pilate who appears to her in the form of an eagle, announcing to her that she would live only the third part of an hour longer than her husband. After uttering these words it was seized, its two wings were bound together, its head cut off, and it died. As said above, the interpretation given by Jesus (§§ 152–153) presupposes a tradition on Pilate and Procla that is also found in another work of the Pilate literature.

Not only the story of Jesus’ trial before Pilate but also that of the preceding events is clearly determined by the version of the Passion given in the *Acts of Pilate* and kindred literature. After his account of the discovery of the writings of the apostles and the passage on the names and worldly professions of the apostles, Pseudo-Cyril turns to his main source—apparently not the Bible—when he says, in § 21:

---

<sup>75</sup> The appearance of Christ as an eagle (on the Tree of Knowledge) is also found in the long version of the *Apocryphon of John*, NHC II, 23,26–28; ed. M. Waldstein & F. Wisse, *The Apocryphon of John. Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV,1 with BG 8502,2* (NHMS 33), Leiden: Brill, 1995, 115 (Synopsis 62, 12–13). There is no relationship between these traditions.

But let us not speak amply about the things we found written in the holy Gospels. But after all these signs he (Jesus) did the Jews began to be angry with him, as Luke the Evangelist has informed us. But listen and let me tell you for what reason the chief priests of the Jews were angry with him.

From there on, Pseudo-Cyril's discourse is dominated by the story of the Passion as told in the apocryphal literature on Pilate.

In the *Acts of Pilate*, 1, 1, the chief priest and the scribes put forth the following accusation against Jesus:<sup>76</sup>

We know that this man is the son of Joseph the Carpenter and was born from Mary; but he says that he is the son of God and a king. Moreover he profanes the Sabbaths and wishes to destroy the law of our fathers. (...) We have a law that we should not heal anyone on the Sabbath. But this man with his evil deeds has healed on the Sabbath the lame, the mutilated, the withered, the blind, the paralytic, the deaf, and the demoniacs.

The accusation that Jesus preferred to perform his healings on the Sabbath is repeated in *Acts of Pilate*, 2, 6 and 4, 2. The short summary of the different kind of healings in 1, 1 is exemplified by the witnesses in favour of Jesus in the chapters 6 (the man who had been ill for 38 years, the man born blind, the bent and the leper), 7 (the woman with the issue of blood), and 8 (a multitude of both men and women saying: 'the demons are subject to him'). The same is found in the *Report (Anaphora) of Pilate*, 1–5, where the governor informs the emperor that the Jews had accused Jesus of many healings on the Sabbath: he made the blind see and the lame walk; he raised the dead, purified the leper, and healed the paralytic; he even raised a man who had been dead for four days, he drove out demons and drowned them in the sea; he healed a man with a withered hand and also a woman who had issued blood for many years. He did these miracles on the Sabbath.<sup>77</sup>

These accusations before Pilate are used by Pseudo-Cyril to explain why the Jewish leaders wanted to kill Jesus. He relates how the Jews stopped bringing tithes to the temple and instead brought their gold and silver to

---

<sup>76</sup> Ed. Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 215; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apócrifos*, 429. The translation is that of Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 170.

<sup>77</sup> Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 434–442; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apócrifos*, 508–511 (not translated by James and Elliott). It should be noted that such enumerations of Jesus' miracles were not uncommon, also outside the literature on Pilate, especially as proof of his divine nature. See, for instance, Athanasius, *De incarnatione verbi*, 16: he healed people who were leprous, lame, deaf, and blind, turned water into wine, walked on the sea, and fed a great multitude.

Jesus (§ 29), because of the miracles he performed. As in the texts on Pilate, there is in Pseudo-Cyril a long and even skillfully arranged enumeration of the different kinds of miracles performed by Jesus. Of each kind of healing two instances are given:

- § 24 two resurrections: the daughter of Jairus (Matthew 9:18–19, 23–25; Mark 5:22–24, 35–43; Luke 8:40–42, 49–56) and the son of the widow (Luke 7:11–17), and two healings of people who were nearly dead: the son of the royal servant (John 4:46–54) and the son of the centurion (Matthew 8:5–13; Luke 7:1–10).
- § 25 two healings of blind people: the blind-born (John 9:1–12) and two blind men (Matthew 20:29–34), and two healings of paralysed men: the paralytic (Matthew 9:2–8; Mark 2:1–12; Luke 5:18–26) and the man with the withered hand (Matthew 12:9–14; Mark 3:1–6; Luke 6:6–11).
- § 26 two expulsions of demons: the man (or men) possessed by a legion of demons (Matthew 8:28–34; Mark 5:1–20; Luke 8:6–39) and Mary Magdalene (Mark 16:9; Luke 8:2).
- § 27 two miracles against the laws of nature: the multiplication of the bread (mentioning the two biblical stories, which slightly upsets the scheme of pairs: five breads—twelve baskets [Matthew 14:15–21; Mark 6:35–44; Luke 9:12–17] and seven breads—seven baskets [Matthew 15:32–39; Mark 8:1–9]), and Jesus walking on the sea (Matthew 14:22–33; Mark 6:45–52, John 6:16–21).
- § 28 two healings of persons who had been ill for a very long time: the woman with the issue of blood (Matthew 9:20–22; Mark 5:25–34; Luke 8:43–48) and the crippled man (John 5:1–15).<sup>78</sup>

Just as in the Pilate literature, Pseudo-Cyril emphasizes that most of these miracles took place on the Sabbath (§ 29). It seems probable that he found his neatly arranged list of Jesus' healings in his source and that this source later related the resurrection of Lazarus, which is mostly also mentioned in these lists of Jesus miracles, in connection with Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem (cf. §§ 47–50).

The alleged profanation of the Sabbath and the destruction of the law (or temple, or synagogue) by Jesus have been combined in Pseudo-Cyril, as in the above quoted *Acts of Pilate* 1, 1, with the accusation that he claims to be the son of God and a king, though he is commonly known to be the son of

---

<sup>78</sup> Erroneously identified by Pseudo-Cyril with the dropsical man of Luke 14:2; see p. 135, n. 37.



Joseph the Carpenter and Mary. When the chief priests and the teachers of the law see 'the dissolution of their synagogue' (§ 32) by Jesus, they say to the rulers of the people (§ 33):

If you refrain from action, he will draw the multitude to him and make the temple desert and abolish our law, and the whole of Israel will be ashamed because he says: 'I am the Son of God.' And he is not, but his mother is Mary and his father is Joseph and he is one of our people.

In Pseudo-Cyril, the Jewish leaders mostly speak of Jesus as "the son of the carpenter" (§§ 32, 33, 34, 61), as in *Acts of Pilate*, 1, 1. The *Acts of Pilate*, 2, 3, furthermore contains the accusation that Jesus had been born of fornication, which, however, is not mentioned in Pseudo-Cyril.<sup>79</sup>

The influence of the Pilate cycle on Pseudo-Cyril sometimes betrays itself in minor details. In the *Acts of Pilate*, 9, 1, Pilate asks Nicodemus and the twelve men who had testified in favour of Jesus: 'What shall I do? For there rises rebellion (στάσις) among the people.' He then offers the people to choose between Barabbas and Jesus. In reaction to their wish to have Jesus crucified, Pilate says, 9, 2: 'Your nation is always rebellious (στασιαστόν).' The Greek words derive from Mark 15:7, where Barabbas is said to have been in custody together with the rebels (στασιαστῶν) who had committed murder in the rebellion (στάσει). In the *Acts of Pilate*, they are put into Pilate's mouth to characterize the general sentiment among the Jews.<sup>80</sup> The same is found in Pseudo-Cyril, where Pilate, after the Jews had chosen Barabbas, says to Jesus: 'Truly, I want to release you but I do not know what to do with this rebellious people (ἡγεῖνος ἡστασιαστῆς) that wants to kill you' (§ 130).

The material presented in this section may suffice to show that Pseudo-Cyril's narrative of the Passion was strongly influenced by the revision and expansion of the Gospel story found in the *Acts of Pilate* and kindred literature. Most probably, Pseudo-Cyril made use of a now lost comprehensive version of this literature which combined several stories which we only know from separate writings. It seems likely that even his most striking apocryphal piece of information, the chronology of Holy Week, derives from that source.

<sup>79</sup> See, however, p. 135, n. 45 below.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. also the *Paradosis of Pilate*, 3 (Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 450; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 522): (Pilate to the Emperor:) 'rebellious and insubordinate (στασιαστόν καὶ ἀνυποτακτόν) is their people,' and 9 (Tischendorf 454; de Santos Otero, 525): (in prayer before decapitation): 'for they raised a rebellion (στάσιν) against me.'

#### 4. *The Chronology of Holy Week*<sup>81</sup>

In his story of the Passion, Pseudo-Cyril presents a chronology of Holy Week which, until now, was only known from chapter 21 of the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum* (first half of the third century)<sup>82</sup> and the works of Epiphanius of Salamis (second half of the fourth century), who was dependent on an early version of the *Didascalia*.<sup>83</sup> It is most probably also due to the influence of the *Didascalia* that the same chronology found its way into the

<sup>81</sup> The following is an adapted and expanded version of a paper read at the Sixth International Congress of Coptic Studies (1996); see R. van den Broek, 'An Early Chronology of Holy Week in Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem's *On the Passion* (Pierpont Morgan Library, M 610),' in S. Emmel et al., *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologen Kongresses Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996*, Band 2: *Schrifttum, Sprache und Gedankenwelt*, Wiesbaden 1999, 101–108.

<sup>82</sup> The *Didascalia* was edited and translated by A. Vööbus, *The Didascalia in Syriac* (CSCO 401/407 [text] and 402/408 [English transl.]), Louvain: CSCO, 1979. We need not enter here into the many problems raised by the present 21st chapter of the *Didascalia*, in which several stages of development can be detected. For an analysis of this chapter and the history of previous research, see *int. al.* A. Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders* (TU, 121), Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977, 325–352, and G.A.M. Rouwhorst, *Les hymnes pascales d'Ephrem de Nisibe. Analyse théologique et recherche sur l'évolution de la fête pascale chrétienne à Nisibe et à Edessa et dans quelques Églises voisines au quatrième siècle*, I (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, VII, 1), Leiden: Brill, 1989, 157–190. Rouwhorst makes a clear distinction between the two versions of this chapter, represented by two groups of manuscripts which he calls 'type A' and 'type B.' See his French translation of the two versions of *Didascalia* 21 in his *Hymnes pascales*, II (Suppl. VC, VII, 2) Leiden: Brill, 1989, 125–139. The complete chronology of Holy Week only occurs in the texts of type A, which according to Rouwhorst is a later interpolation (albeit not later than the fourth century). However that may be, the chronology itself must have been known to the original author(s) of the *Didascalia*, for it is said in both types that Judas delivered Jesus to the Jewish leaders 'in the night when the fourth day of the week dawned ... But they gave the fee to Judas on the tenth of the month, on the second day of the week' (Vööbus CSCO 408, 198, 9–12; Rouwhorst, II, 134). With respect to the chronology in Pseudo-Cyril, the question of the two versions is not important, because they both existed long before the homily of Pseudo-Cyril was written.

<sup>83</sup> For Epiphanius see K. Holl, 'Ein Bruchstück aus einem unbekannten Brief des Epiphanius,' in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, II: *Der Osten*, Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1928, reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964, 204–224, and his *Panarion*, 51, 26–27 and 70, 9–15 (on the Audians, who knew an early version of the *Didascalia*); also Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte*, 316–324. For an English translation of Epiphanius' *Letter*, see below, Appendix 2. Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 224, dated the *Letter* between 367 and 373, i.e. between the appointment of Epiphanius as bishop of Constantia and the death of Athanasius, who vehemently reacted against the former's exposition. However, only the latter date is certain, for Epiphanius' bishopric (τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἐπιφανίου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντίας τῆς Κυπρίων νήσου) is only mentioned in the superscription of the *Letter*, which apparently was added after his death (he is already ἐν ἀγίοις). The *Letter* may have been written before he became a bishop.

Manichaeen Psalmbook.<sup>84</sup> The most peculiar feature of this chronology is that the Last Supper and the arrest of Jesus did not take place in the evening of Thursday and the subsequent night, as is testified unanimously by the canonical Gospels, but as early as the evening of Tuesday and the night preceding Wednesday. Because of the great importance of the *Didascalia* for the understanding of Pseudo-Cyril's chronology of Holy Week, it may be useful to quote here the relevant passages of its chapter 21. In the long passage that is found in the manuscripts of type A only (most probably a later interpolation)<sup>85</sup> it is said about the deliverance of Jesus by Judas:

Now this was on the fourth day of the week. Indeed, when we had eaten the Passover on the third day of the week in the evening, we went out to the Mount of Olives, and in the night they seized our Lord Jesus. And the next day, which was the fourth day of the week, He remained in custody in the house of Caiaphas the high priest. And on the same day the chiefs of the people were assembled and took counsel against Him.

And on the next day again, which was the fifth of the week, they brought Him to Pilate the governor. And He remained again in custody with Pilate the night after the fifth day of the week. But when it dawned on Friday, 'they accused Him much' (Mark 15:3) before Pilate. And they could show nothing that was true, but gave false witness against Him. And they asked Him from Pilate to be put to death. And they crucified Him on the same Friday. He suffered then, at the sixth hour on Friday.<sup>86</sup>

The second relevant passage is found in all manuscripts and represents an earlier tradition:

For when our Lord and teacher ate the Passover with us, He was delivered up by Judas after that hour, and immediately we began to be grieved because He was taken from us. By the number of the moon, as we count according to the reckoning of the believing Hebrews, on the tenth of the moon, on the second day of the week, 'the priests and elders of the people assembled and came to the court of Caiaphas the high priest; and they devised to seize Jesus and kill Him; but they feared, and were saying: Not during the festival, lest the people

---

<sup>84</sup> See S. Giversen (ed.), *The Manichaeen Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library. Facsimile Edition, III, Psalm Book, Part I* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 16), Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1988, Pl. 176, 13–15: 'He was arrested on the fourth day, he was judged on the fifth day, he was crucified in the evening of the sixth day.' I here follow the text of this psalm as presented by G. Wurst, 'Die Bedeutung der manichäischen Sonntagsfeier (Manichäisches Psalmenbuch I, 127),' in Emmel, *Ägypten und Nubien*, II, 563–580 (text and German translation of the passage on 566–567).

<sup>85</sup> See above p. 39, n. 83.

<sup>86</sup> Translation Vööbus, CSCO 408, 189, 9–190, 3. I here wish to thank Mr. Paul Peeters of Peeters Publishers, Louvain, for allowing me to quote extensively from Vööbus's translation.

be perturbed' (Matthew 26:3–5), for everyone 'was hanging upon Him' (Luke 19:48), and 'they held him for a prophet' (Matthew 21:46) on account of His miracles of healings which He did among them.

But Jesus was in that day 'in the house of Simon the Leper' (Matthew 26:6), and we ate together with Him and He narrated to us what was about to happen to Him. But Judas wernt out from us in secret, hoping that he would evade our Lord, and went to the house of Caiaphas where the chief priests and the elders were assembled, and said to them: 'What do you give me, and I deliver Him to you' (Matthew 26:15) when I have an opportunity? But they appointed and gave him thirty pieces of silver. And he said to them: 'Make ready young men armed, because of His disciples, that if He go out by night to a desert place, I may come and lead you.' And they made ready the young men and prepared to seize Him. And Judas 'was watching, when he might find for him an opportunity to deliver Him up' (Matthew 26:16).

But because of the crowds of all the people, from every town and from all the villages, who were coming up to the temple to perform the Passover in Jerusalem, the priests and elders devised and commanded and appointed that they would perform the festival immediately, that they might seize Him without disturbance. Indeed the people of Jerusalem were occupied with the sacrifice and the eating of the Passover. And moreover, all the people from without had not yet come, because they had deceived them as to the days. That they might be reproved before God of erring greatly in everything, therefore they anticipated the Passover by three days, and performed it on the eleventh of the moon, on the third day of the week. Indeed they said: 'Because all the people go astray after Him, now that we have an opportunity, let us seize Him; and then when all the people have come, let us kill him before everyone, that this may be known openly, and all the people turn back from after Him.'

And thus in the night when the fourth day of the week dawned, he (namely Judas) delivered up our Lord to them. But they gave the fee to Judas on the tenth of the month, on the second day of the week. On this account they were reckoned by God as though on the second day of the week (they had seized Him, because on the second of the week) they had devised to seize Him and to kill Him. And they accomplished their wickedness on the Friday, as Moses had said about the Passover thus: 'It shall be kept by you from the tenth until the fourteenth, and then all Israel shall sacrifice the Passover' (Exodus 12:6).

On this account you shall fast in the days of the Pascha from the tenth, which is the second day of the week. And you shall be sustained only by bread and salt and water, at the ninth hour, until the fifth day of the week. On the Friday, however, and on the Sabbath, fast entirely, and taste nothing.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Translation Vööbus, CSCO 408, 196, 19–199, 2.

Scholars agree that in the present text of the *Didascalia* the peculiar chronology of Holy Week serves to establish a paschal fast of six days, from Monday to Saturday, so that on each day one specific aspect of Christ's passion could be commemorated.<sup>88</sup> Although Epiphanius transmitted the tradition of the *Didascalia*, his chronology is not always in agreement with that of the latter. Moreover, Pseudo-Cyril's report reveals some substantial differences with respect to both the *Didascalia* and Epiphanius. So we are faced with the question of whether Pseudo-Cyril borrowed his data directly from the *Didascalia* or from Epiphanius or from another unknown source which contained the same tradition.

In our apocryphon, the Hebrew month Nisan, the Roman month April, and the Egyptian month Parmoute are held to coincide completely (§§ 1 and 157). This identification is not correct, since Parmoute (Pharmouthi) began on the 21st of Nisan and the 27th of March.<sup>89</sup> Though incorrect, this opinion does not stand alone in Greek and Coptic texts. It is also found in Flavius Josephus and in a Coptic Sermon on the Passion of Christ, falsely attributed to Evodius of Rome.<sup>90</sup> Moreover, Pseudo-Cyril states repeatedly that at the time of Jesus' arrest the solar year ran parallel to the lunar year, so that 'the day of the moon coincided with the day of the month.' (§§ 4 and 82). The simple identification of the months Nisan, Parmoute, and April is not mentioned in the *Didascalia*, which only speaks of the days of the moon and of Nisan, and is even explicitly excluded by Epiphanius, who says that Jesus was crucified on the 14th according to the moon reckoning, i.e. the 24th of the month Phamenoth and the 20th of March (XIII Kal. Apr.).<sup>91</sup>

The agreements and differences between Pseudo-Cyril and the other sources containing this chronology will become evident from the following comparison of the relevant texts:

1. *The first day of Parmoute (Saturday)*: According to Pseudo-Cyril, Jesus arrived in Jerusalem on the first day of Parmoute, a Sabbath, on which the

<sup>88</sup> See *int. al.* Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 211, and Rouwhorst, *Hymnes Pascales*, I, 184.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. W.C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, 4th ed., Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1970, 88 (§178).

<sup>90</sup> Josephus, *Ant. Iud.*, II, 311: Moses had commanded to prepare the Passover on the tenth day of the Macedonian month Xantikos to the fourteenth, ὅς παρὰ μὲν Αἰγυπτίοις Φαρμουθὶ καλεῖται, Νισάν δὲ παρ' Ἑβραίοις, Μακεδόνες δ' αὐτόν Ξαντικὸν προσαγορεύουσιν. For the text of Pseudo-Evodius, see p. 123, n. 7.

<sup>91</sup> Epiphanius, *Letter*, 207, 13–15. Holl: ὥρα γ' ἐσταυρώθη πλήρης ἕκτη σαββάτων τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτη κατὰ σελήνην, τετάρτη καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ Φαμενώθ μηνός, πρὸ ἣ' καλάνδων Ἀπριλίων; See also p. 187.

deliverance from the Egyptian slavery was commemorated (§ 67). On that same day, Judas had his first contact with the Jewish leaders concerning the delivery of Jesus and received an advance on his reward (§ 71). Nothing of all this is found in any of the related texts.

2. *The tenth day of Parmoute (Monday)*: According to Pseudo-Cyril, it was on Monday, the tenth day of Parmoute, that the Jewish leaders took counsel, made a definitive agreement with Judas, and paid him the rest of his reward (§§ 72–75). The *Didascalia* and Epiphanius also assign these events to Monday, the tenth of Nisan, and say that Judas received the *whole* price of 30 silver pieces.<sup>92</sup> The *Didascalia* explicitly refers to the Jewish reckoning of the (lunar) month Nisan: ‘By the number of the moon, as we count according to the reckoning of the believing Hebrews, on the tenth of the moon, on the second day of the week,’ the Jewish counsel took place.<sup>93</sup> The same reckoning is followed by Pseudo-Cyril with respect to the third day of the week (see below, sub 3). According to the *Didascalia*, the Jewish leaders were reckoned by God as though they had seized Jesus on that day: ‘On this account you shall fast in the days of the Pascha from the tenth, which is the second day of the week.’<sup>94</sup> Epiphanius says that Jesus ‘was led to the mystery on the second day of the week,’ and that this was only logical because that day was the tenth of the month and Jesus’ name began with a *iōta*, which has the numerical value of 10!<sup>95</sup> The *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, which were based on the *Didascalia* but dropped the unfamiliar chronology of Holy Week, retained the view that it was on Monday that the Jews began to conspire against Jesus.<sup>96</sup>

3. *The eleventh day of Parmoute (Tuesday)*: Pseudo-Cyril reports that it was on Tuesday, in the evening of ‘the third day of the week, the eleventh day of the month, when the day of the moon coincided with the day of the month,’ (§ 82) that Jesus celebrated the Last Supper with his disciples, went to the Mount of Olives, and was arrested there by the Jews led by Judas (§§ 82–90). The *Didascalia* and Epiphanius also state that the Passover was on Tuesday.

<sup>92</sup> *Didascalia* 21 (Vööbus CSCO 408, 196, 21–197, 14), see above p. 41; Epiphanius, *Letter*, 205, 7–12 Holl; see below p. 185.

<sup>93</sup> *Didascalia*, 21 (Vööbus, CSCO 408, 196, 22–24), see above p. 40.

<sup>94</sup> *Didascalia*, 21 (Vööbus CSCO 408, 198, 10–20), see above p. 41.

<sup>95</sup> Epiphanius, *Letter*, 205, 8–10 Holl; see below p. 185.

<sup>96</sup> *Const. Apost.*, V, 14, 1 (ed. Metzger, SC 329, 248): “Ἡρξάντο γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐπιβουλὴν ποιεῖσθαι δευτέρᾳ σαββάτων μηνὶ πρώτῳ, ὅς ἐστιν Ξαντικός.

In the section of the *Didascalía*'s chapter 21 which is only found in the texts of type A, it is simply said: 'Indeed, when we had eaten the Passover on the third day of the week in the evening, we went out to the Mount of Olives, and in the night they seized our Lord Jesus.'<sup>97</sup> But later on, both recensions of the text provide an explanation for this celebration so early in the week: the Jewish leaders, when they took counsel on Monday, had decided to anticipate the real date of the Passover by three days, in order to arrest Jesus without disturbance.<sup>98</sup> In the reckoning of the three days, the first day is included: the Passover was anticipated by two days, it was celebrated on Tuesday instead of Thursday.

The same explanation is found in Epiphanius, who speaks about two days,<sup>99</sup> but is not clear about the dates involved. As we saw above, he suggests, on the one hand, that the second day of the week, Monday, was the tenth of the month Nisan (see sub 2), but that seems a traditional element, for on the other hand he explicitly states that Jesus ate the Passover not on the *eleventh* day of the month, as Pseudo-Cyril explicitly says, but on the *twelfth* day, 'as the thirteenth drew on (ἐπιφωσκούσης ἑγ'), the night being reckoned to the day, i.e. from the third to the fourth day.'<sup>100</sup> At this point, he obviously follows the usual Jewish reckoning of the day, which run from sunset to sunset, and thus reckoned the night to the following day, as is also explicitly done by the *Didascalía*.<sup>101</sup> But for the rest Epiphanius is rather vague about the reckoning of day and night. In any case, as far as the days of the month are concerned, in his *Letter* he is obviously one day ahead of

<sup>97</sup> *Didascalía* 21 (Vööbus CSCO 408, 189, 9–12); see also p. 40 above.

<sup>98</sup> *Didascalía*, 21 (Vööbus CSCO 408, 197, 19–198, 8); see also p. 41 above.

<sup>99</sup> Epiphanius, *Letter*, 205, 1–4, Holl. On p. 206, 1ff., he puts the Last Supper on the 12th day, 'when the 13th drew on' (see also pp. 185–186 below). The same in *Panarion*, 51, 26, 1: 'They thus ate the Passover two days before its (proper) eating; that is on the third day in the evening, which ought to be done on the fifth day in the evening.'

<sup>100</sup> *Letter*, 206, 1–3, Holl: βεβρώκει τοίνυν μετ' αὐτῶν τὸ πάσχα πρὸς ἑσπέραν τῇ δωδεκάτῃ πρὸ δύο ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα, ἐπιφωσκούσης ἑγ', λογιζομένης τῆς νυκτὸς εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τουτέστιν ἀπὸ τρίτης εἰς τετράδα σαββάτων. It should be noted that the word ἐπιφώσκειν not only means 'dawn, begin to grow light,' but is also used to indicate the beginning of a day in a more general sense, even if this day was reckoned to begin at sunset, as was common among the Jews; cf. Lampe, *Lexicon*, 540a, s.v., and *int. al.* the long note to the *Gospel of Peter*, 5 (σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει, cf. Luke 23:54), by L. Vaganay, *L'Évangile de Pierre*, Paris: Gabalda et Fils, 1930, 214–217.

<sup>101</sup> *Didascalía*, 21 (Vööbus, CSCO 408, 191, 23–192, 3), the Christians should fast for the Jews on Wednesday, 'because on the fourth day of the week they began to destroy their souls, and seized me. For the night after the third of the week is the fourth of the week, as it is written: "There was evening and there was morning, one day" (Gen. 1:5). The evening therefore belongs to the following day.'

the numbering of Pseudo-Cyril, as also appears from his repeated statement that the fifth day of the week fell on the fourteenth of the month.<sup>102</sup> But in his *Panarion*, 51, 26, 3, he says, with Pseudo-Cyril, that Jesus was arrested 'on that same third day, which was the nighttime of the eleventh of the month, the sixteenth of the Kalends of April.'<sup>103</sup> Here the night seems to be reckoned to belong to the preceding day, but in the following sections of his *Panarion*, Epiphanius complicated the reckoning of the days to such an extent that he (or the later textual tradition) got entangled in obscurities and contradictions.<sup>104</sup> Pseudo-Cyril is silent about this deliberate anticipation; there is no indication that the author was aware of the uncanonical character of his chronology.

4. *The twelfth day of Parmoute (Wednesday)*: Pseudo-Cyril clearly assumes that Jesus was seized on 'the fourth day of the week' (§108), 'the twelfth day of the moon of the month April, which is Parmoute' (§157). The same is found in the *Didascalia*: Judas came and betrayed Jesus 'on the fourth day of the week'; this happened 'in the night when the fourth day of the week dawned.'<sup>105</sup> *Psalm* 127 of the Manichaean Psalmbook simply says: 'He was arrested on the fourth day.'<sup>106</sup> Epiphanius states that Jesus was arrested 'on the third day of the week, when the fourth drew on,'<sup>107</sup> which presupposes the Greek (and Coptic) reckoning of the days, from sunrise to sunrise, divided into two parts of each 12 hours. Pseudo-Cyril also follows this reckoning. He says (§104):

And immediately they seized Jesus and brought him to the High Priest. As he, then, saw him he was very pleased. It was the ninth hour of the night of the third day of the week. And at dawn, early on the fourth day of the week, Jesus stood before Caiaphas.

<sup>102</sup> *Letter*, 205, 15–16 and 19–20 Holl, see below p. 185.

<sup>103</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion* 51, 26, 3 Holl: συλλαμβάνεται δὲ τῇ αὐτῇ τρίτῃ ὀψέ, ἥτις ἦν ἐνδεκάτη τῆς ἐλεήνης νυκτερινῇ πρὸ δεκαῆς καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων.

<sup>104</sup> He also assumes that the Jews not only anticipated the date of the Passover by two days, but also made a mistake in their calculations, which led him to an exposition of the Jewish computation of the lunar year and the paschal week which is anything but clear; see Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 208–209, and idem (ed.), *Epiphanius*, II, 2nd ed. by J. Dummer, Berlin 1980, 296–297; also A. Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte*, 303–309, and the notes in F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III (Sects 47–80, De Fide)* (NHMS 36), Leiden: Brill, 1994, 57–59.

<sup>105</sup> *Didascalia* 21 (Vööbus CSCO 408, 189, 9); see above p. 41.

<sup>106</sup> See p. 40, n. 84.

<sup>107</sup> Epiphanius, *Letter*, 205, 20–21; 206, 6 Holl (see below p. 107); also *Panarion*, 51, 26, 3 (see above note 103).



According to the Greek and Coptic division of the day, the night of the third day is the night from Tuesday to Wednesday, of which the ninth hour is at about 3 a.m. In all other instances where Pseudo-Cyril mentions exact hours—most probably a later development of this chronology, as will be shown—the author also seems to have computed the days according to the usual Greek and Coptic reckoning. Both the *Didascalia* and Epiphanius explain the weekly fast on Wednesday as a commemoration of the arrest of Jesus on the fourth day of the week.<sup>108</sup> The same reasoning is found in *De fabrica mundi*, a work by Victorinus of Pettau, who died as a martyr in AD 304.<sup>109</sup> Pseudo-Cyril does not mention it.

There is still another text which must be mentioned in this connection, which brings us back to the apocryphal literature on Pilate. In the *Story of Joseph of Arimathaea*, a late Byzantine specimen of the Pilate cycle, it is said that Jesus was arrested on Tuesday in the evening, was set free in the evening of Wednesday, and was arrested again on Thursday in the evening.<sup>110</sup> A full discussion of this extremely fantastic story would carry us too far, but some of its chronological data have to be mentioned, for the source used by the author of this apocryphon must have been closely related to that reproduced by our Coptic text. This appears from the fact that both texts state that Jesus was brought to the High Priest at the ninth hour. Pseudo-Cyril thought of the ninth hour of the night preceding the fourth day of the week, i.e. at about 3 a.m. In the *Story of Joseph*, however, it is said that Jesus was brought to the court of Caiaphas at the ninth hour of the fourth day, i.e. on Wednesday at about 3 p.m.<sup>111</sup> It is conceivable that the source of this writing followed the Jewish reckoning of the days and that originally the ninth hour of the night preceding the fourth day was meant. What is more important is that this indication of the ninth hour, at which Jesus was brought before the High Priest, is mentioned neither in the *Didascalia* nor by Epiphanius.

<sup>108</sup> *Didascalia*, 21 (Vööbus CSCO 408, 191,20–192,3) (see above p. 44, n. 101); Epiphanius, *Letter*, 206, 3–5 Holl; see below p. 186.

<sup>109</sup> Victorinus of Pettau, *De fabrica mundi*, 3 (ed. J. Haussleiter, *Victorini Episcopi Petavienensis opera* [CSEL 49], Vienna / Leipzig: F. Tempski / G. Freitag, 1916, 4; M. Dulaey, *Victorin de Poetovio* [SC 423], Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1997, 140): 'Homo Christus Jesus ... tetradē ab impiis comprehensus est. Itaque ob captivitatem eius tetradem ... (aut stationem) aut superpositionem facimus.'

<sup>110</sup> *Story of Joseph of Arimathaea*, 1–2 (Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 459–470; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 533–544). On his first arrest, 1, 3: Συνελήφθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ πάσχα τρίτης, ὀψίας οὔσης.

<sup>111</sup> *Story of Joseph of Arimathaea*, 2, 1 (Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 462; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 535): Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἡμέρα τῆς τετράδος, εἰσήνεγκαν αὐτὸν ὧρα ἑνάτη εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ Καϊάφα.

The sources for this peculiar chronology of the Holy Week disagree on what happened on the fourth day, Wednesday. The *Didascalia* says that, during that whole day, Jesus 'remained in custody in the house of Caiaphas the high priest. (...) And on the next day again, which was the fifth of the week, they brought him to Pilate the governor.'<sup>112</sup> The *Story of Joseph of Arimathea* also presupposes the tradition that Jesus remained in the house of Caiaphas throughout the whole of the fourth day (and was released in the evening).<sup>113</sup> Epiphanius, however, says that Jesus was brought to Pilate at dawn on the fourth day, Wednesday, and was detained in the palace of the governor until Thursday morning.<sup>114</sup> At this point, Pseudo-Cyril again gives an exact indication of the hour at which Jesus was brought to Pilate, viz. 'the eleventh hour of the fourth day of the week,' that is to say on Wednesday at about 5 p.m. (§ 113). Most probably, we are confronted here with a scribal error, for later on it is said that Jesus was sent to Herod, who was in Galilee, on the fourth hour of the fourth day (§ 120). Originally, the text may have said that Jesus was brought to Pilate on the 'the first hour of the fourth day.'<sup>115</sup> In which case Pseudo-Cyril would be in complete agreement with Epiphanius, who says that Jesus was brought to Pilate at dawn of the fourth day. If we accept this as the original view, the other events which, according to Pseudo-Cyril, happened on Wednesday present no problems. Jesus was sent to Herod in Galilee on the fourth hour of the fourth day, i.e. on Wednesday at about 10.00 a.m. Herod sent Jesus back at sunset of the same day, the journey took the whole night, so that Jesus was back again at Pilate's palace at sunrise on the fifth day (§ 125–126). Most likely, the original version of the chronology of the Passion presupposed that Jesus was sent to Herod *in Jerusalem* on Thursday, as is explicitly said by Epiphanius and not contradicted, though not explicitly stated, by the *Didascalia*.<sup>116</sup> It seems that Pseudo-Cyril or, more probably, his direct source,

<sup>112</sup> *Didascalia* 21 (Vööbus CSCO 408, 189,12–13); see above p. 40.

<sup>113</sup> *Story of Joseph of Arimathea*, 2, 2 (Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 462–463; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocryfos*, 536): 'Οψίας δὲ τελεσθείσης τῆς τετάρδος (...). Καὶ δόλῳ ἀπέλυσαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

<sup>114</sup> Epiphanius, *Letter*, 206, 11–13 Holl (zie p. 186 below): πρῶας δὲ παραδίδοται Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ· γέγονε δὲ τοῦτο τετάρτῃ τῶν σαββάτων. καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην παρὰ Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἕως πρῶτῃ.

<sup>115</sup> It is also conceivable that the original author made a mistake and that his source spoke of 'the eleventh hour of the night of the fourth day of the week' after the Jewish manner, that is to say, on Wednesday at about 5 a.m.

<sup>116</sup> Epiphanius, *Letter*, 206, 13–15 Holl (see p. 188 below): πέμπτῃ δὲ σαββάτῳ ἀποστέλλεται πρὸς Ἡρώδην, ὅντα τότε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, διὰ τὸ καὶ αὐτὸν ἐληλυθέναι μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων φαγεῖν τὸ πᾶσχα.

which belonged to the Pilate cycle, advanced the journey to Herod by one day to allow time for the occurrence of quite different events on Thursday which were also transmitted in the apocryphal literature on Pilate. The idea that Jesus had to go to *Galilee* to be questioned there by Herod cannot have been Pseudo-Cyril's own invention, for in his summary of the events which took place on the fourth day of the week, Herod is supposed to have been in Jerusalem: 'On this day Jesus walked on foot and went to Herod in Jerusalem' (§158).

5. *The thirteenth day of Parmoute (Thursday)*: According to Pseudo-Cyril, it was on Thursday, the thirteenth of Parmoute, that Pilate sought to set Jesus free instead of Barabbas. This happened towards the evening, for the Jewish leaders refused to persuade the people to choose Jesus by saying that the sun had set and that many of the people had already gone home (§§127–129). This would be more easily understood if Jesus had been sent to Herod in the morning of the same day. Then Jesus was questioned by Pilate and Herod on Thursday, as is indeed claimed in Manichaean *Psalm* 127: 'He was judged on the fifth day.'<sup>117</sup> Epiphanius also says that this is precisely what happened, and he adds that Jesus was back at the praetorium at the ninth hour, i.e. at about 3 p.m., of Thursday. In this connection, Epiphanius hands down an ancient tradition according to which the disciples had secretly come to Jesus in his prison at the ninth hour and that he had broken bread with them. This peculiar tradition most probably served to explain a usage which is elsewhere testified by Epiphanius to have been current in certain quarters of the Church of his time, viz. to celebrate the eucharist during Holy Week on Thursday at 3 p.m., without observing the vigil during the night before Good Friday that was usual in other places.<sup>118</sup> There might be some connection between this tradition and the remarkable story in Pseudo-Cyril that, on the evening of that day, the governor and his prisoner had a meal together in the dining-room of the palace, served by a boy of about ten years old (§§132–135). The events which followed during the night, *inter alia* horrifying dreams of Pilate and his wife

<sup>117</sup> See p. 40, n. 84.

<sup>118</sup> Epiphanius, *Letter*, 206, 13–20 Holl (see below p. 186); cf. Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 211, with reference to Epiphanius, *De fide*, 22, 13: 'In some places the eucharist is celebrated at the ninth hour of the fifth day and thus the faithful are dismissed, though they remain on the same dry food' (ἐν τισὶ δὲ τόποις λατρεία οἰκονομίας ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ γίνεται ὥρα ἐνάτῃ καὶ οὕτως ἀπολύει μενόντων ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ξηροφαγίᾳ).

Procla (§§ 138–153), must derive from the literature on Pilate, probably with free additions by Pseudo-Cyril himself.

The preceding discussion leads to the following conclusions. The comparison of Pseudo-Cyril's chronology with that of the *Didascalia* and Epiphanius shows that Pseudo-Cyril neither depends on the former nor, at least directly, on the latter, but made free use of a more advanced form of the *Didascalia*'s chronology of Holy Week. As a whole, this chronology originally intended to provide a historical basis for the liturgical custom of a six days paschal fast. Most probably in this form: on Monday the counsel of the Jewish leaders and their agreement with Judas, on Tuesday the Last Supper, on Wednesday the arrest of Jesus and his trial before Caiaphas, on Thursday the sending to Pilate and Herod, on Friday the last trial before Pilate and the crucifixion, and on Saturday Jesus in the realm of death. The liturgical background need not imply that some elements of this chronology cannot be much older. Especially the idea that the Passover was eaten on Tuesday evening, that is to say in the early hours of Wednesday according to the Jewish reckoning, may have had a long history, since it seems to presuppose the old Jewish solar calendar, used for instance in the Qumran community, according to which the fourteenth day of Nisan always fell on Tuesday.<sup>119</sup>

In any case, Pseudo-Cyril presupposes the liturgically-based chronology of Holy Week found in the *Didascalia* and Epiphanius. The differences can be explained from the interference of material from the Pilate cycle, which also seems to be responsible for a further development of the chronology. In Pseudo-Cyril, we can see a refinement of the chronology by the addition of the exact hours on which the events of the Passion were supposed to have taken place.<sup>120</sup> So we find Jesus before Caiaphas at the ninth hour of the night preceding Wednesday, before Pilate at the first (according to the text the eleventh) hour of that day, going to Herod at the fourth hour of

---

<sup>119</sup> The existence of this calendar was first pointed out and discussed, primarily based on the data of the *Book of Jubilees*, by A. Jaubert, *La date de la Cène*, Paris: Lecoffre Gabalda, 1957. For more recent literature, especially on the combination of the solar and the lunar year in Essene calculations, see J.M. Baumgarten, '4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar,' *Revue de Qumran* 12 (1985/7) 399–407 (with many references to other studies) and R.T. Beckwith, 'The Essene Calendar and the Moon: A Reconsideration,' *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1992) 457–466.

<sup>120</sup> A first indication of this development might be Epiphanius' report, in his *Letter*, that Jesus returned from Herod on Thursday on the ninth hour, i.e. at 3 p.m., at which time he broke bread with his disciples. However, as said above, it seems more probable that the story which refers to this hour was originally introduced to legitimize the peculiar usage to break the paschal fast on Thursday at 3 p.m.

the fourth day, and returning at dawn the next day. We may assume that Pseudo-Cyril already found these data in his source, as the *Story of Joseph of Arimathea* also claims that Jesus was brought to Caiaphas at the ninth hour (of the fourth day). This interest in the fixation of exact hours is also found in another episode in Pseudo-Cyril's narrative, that of Jesus predicting that Judas and his wife will die on the ninth hour of the sabbath (§ 95 and 96). From this, we may conclude that the various hours which are assigned to the events of the Passion, and therefore the chronology of Holy Week as a whole, derive from the comprehensive apocryphal work on Pilate upon which Pseudo-Cyril's discourse was based.<sup>121</sup> In one way or another, this work must also have had some influence on the fantastic *Story of Joseph of Arimathea*.

Epiphanius' letter was addressed 'to Eusebius, Marcellus, Vivianus and Carpus, but also to the Egyptians.'<sup>122</sup> Holl has shown that Athanasius reacted vehemently to this letter, which contained an attack on the Alexandrian calculation of the correct date of Easter.<sup>123</sup> Nevertheless, Epiphanius remained well-known and respected in Egypt, especially among the Copts.<sup>124</sup> It may therefore be possible that Pseudo-Cyril's peculiar chronology of Holy Week ultimately derives from Epiphanius's letter to the Egyptians. It is inconceivable that Pseudo-Cyril was not aware that this chronology conflicted with that of the canonical Gospels, but apparently he did not care. He only wanted to tell an interesting story of the Passion, with many unknown features.

### 5. *The Divine Christ*

In his presentation of the events of the Holy Week, Pseudo-Cyril leaves no doubt that in his view the Passion of Jesus was a real suffering. He relates that Jesus received such severe blows in the presence of Caiaphas that he became dizzy and fell on his right hip (§ 109). On the other hand, he shows a constant awareness that this suffering man was actually God. In § 110, he

<sup>121</sup> See also Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 29 (ed. Campagnano, *Omélies coptes*, 44/45; see also p. 78 below): 'For he died at the ninth hour, the soldier pierced his side at the tenth hour, Joseph of Arimathea took his body from the cross at the eleventh hour and laid him in the tomb at the hour of sunset (i.e. the twelfth hour).'

<sup>122</sup> See Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 224, see p. 187, n. 14 below.

<sup>123</sup> Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 223–224.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. A. Camplani, 'Epifanio (*Ancoratus*) e Gregorio di Nazianzo (*Epistulae*) in Copto: Identificazioni e *Status Quaestionis*,' *Augustinianum* 35 (1995) 327–347.

exclaims: 'Woe unto me, me, this most humble Cyril: how is it that my fleshly mouth has been able to briefly tell this story, for they have struck my God until he became dizzy and fell.' This view of Christ as the suffering God, in itself an expression of popular monophysitism, allowed Pseudo-Cyril to insert several stories of a seemingly docetic character which in fact served to show the divine nature of the suffering Jesus.

There are two passages in which Jesus reveals his divinity in order to make clear that he could escape his sufferings if he wished to do so. The first is found in §§ 77–79, when Jesus says to his disciples: 'Let me assure you that I am able to escape from everything which is about to befall me; and I know the things that will happen before they do happen. Arise, and let us pray to my Father.' Then follows, in § 78, a passage that must have originated in a completely different context. The story, which until then has been told from the perspective of an uninvolved narrator, is suddenly put into the mouths of the disciples themselves. Moreover, the scene unexpectedly moves from Jerusalem to an unnamed mountain, which cannot be the Mount of Olives. In § 81, Jesus and the disciples leave Jerusalem for the garden on the other side of the brook Kedron (John 18:1–2), the events that happened on the Mount of Olives are told from § 85 onwards. What is described in §§ 78–79 is a transfiguration of Christ, which in its original setting was most probably an appearance of the risen Lord to his disciples:

78. When we, then, prayed, the whole mountain shook beneath us. We were afraid and looked and saw the Saviour like a column of fire, and his feet were with us on the mountain but his head reached to the sky, and he was entirely of fire. And we were like the dead, our whole body trembled and we did not know what happened. 79. Afterwards the Saviour raised all of us, who were like the dead, and we saw him in the shape of his humanity, whereas his invisibility, which actually is his divinity, was hidden within him. Then our Saviour released us from our fear and spoke with us about what would happen to us and about how we would preach.

This manifestation of Christ's hidden divinity is in many respects reminiscent of other descriptions of christophanies. According to the *Apocryphon of John*, the Beloved Disciple saw a vision of Christ as a changing figure of light. This happened on an unspecified mountain, while 'the entire world trembled.'<sup>125</sup> The enormous dimensions of the divine Christ and other heavenly beings are typical for this kind of revelation, of which only two instances may be given here. The *Gospel of Peter*, 40, describes the angels

<sup>125</sup> Waldstein & Wisse (eds), *The Apocryphon of John*, 17 (Synopsis 3, 3–12).

who accompany the risen Christ as reaching with their heads to the skies, while that of Christ himself surpasses the skies.<sup>126</sup> The Elkesaites also taught that the Son of God and the Holy Spirit possessed such enormous dimensions.<sup>127</sup> According to Pseudo-Cyril, the disciples see Christ as 'a column of fire' and as made up 'wholly of fire.' In his Apocalypse 10:1, John sees an angel whose feet, i.e. his legs, are 'columns of fire.'<sup>128</sup> In the canonical stories of the transfiguration, the appearance of Christ is said to be like the sun and white as light (especially Matthew 17:2); the disciples throw themselves to the earth and are very frightened, but they are raised up by Christ when the vision is over and Jesus has regained his usual human shape (Matthew 17:6–8). Pseudo-Cyril reports the same reaction of the disciples and the same reassuring gesture of Christ: 'he released us from our fear.' They see him again in the shape of his humanity, while his divinity, which is called his 'invisibility,' is hidden within him. That Christ's divinity (μῆτινογτε = θεϊότης) is characterized as his invisibility (μῆτατῆαγ = ὁράτος εἶναι, ὁρασιὰ) is in accordance with usual doctrinal terminology and, therefore, most probably constitutes an addition of Pseudo-Cyril to his source.<sup>129</sup> That the divine Christ speaks about the future vicissitudes of the apostles and their propagation of the Gospel seems to indicate that we are here concerned with an original post-Resurrection story, an appearance of the risen Lord to his disciples, which Pseudo-Cyril (or his source) transposed to the beginning of the Passion.<sup>130</sup> This apocryphal transfiguration story may ultimately derive from some gnostic writing, though this is by no means certain.

<sup>126</sup> See M.G. Mara (ed.), *Evangile de Pierre* (SC 201), Paris 1973, 58 and 185, n. 4.

<sup>127</sup> Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, IX, 13, 2–3, and Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 19, 4, 1–2 (also 30, 17, 6–7 and 53, 1, 9). This kind of representation is in itself neither 'heretical' nor typically Christian. The huge shape of Christ is, *int. al.*, also found in Hermas, *Pastor*, Sim. 9,6,1 and in *Acta Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, 10. In *Corpus hermeticum* I, 1, the visionary (most probably Hermes Trismegistus) sees the heavenly Poimandres as an enormous being of infinite size (τινα ὑπερμεγέθη μέτρῳ ἀπεριόριστῳ τυγχάνοντα); cf. A.D. Nock & A.-J. Festugière (eds.), *Corpus hermeticum*, I, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946 (and later reprints), 8, n. 3. Also in the Jewish 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch* 1, 4–5 ('two huge men'); cf. the translation and notes by F.I. Anderson, in J.M. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983 (reprint Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009), 105/106.

<sup>128</sup> See also the description of the angels, 'two huge men,' in 2 *Enoch* 1, 5 (see preceding note): 'Their faces were like the shining sun; their eyes were like burning lamps; from their mouths fire was coming forth.'

<sup>129</sup> See Lampe, *Lexicon*, 168, s.v. ὁράτος, B.3.

<sup>130</sup> Most probably, the canonical Transfiguration (Mark 9:2–10, Matthew 17:1–9, Luke 9:28–36) was originally also a post-Resurrection story, though it also shows the typical features of a theophany, especially as described in Exodus 24 and 33–34; cf. A.Y. Collins, *Mark. A Commentary* (Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible), Minne-

The second passage in which Christ demonstrates that he could escape his passion is found in §137. Pilate advises Jesus to withdraw and says that he is prepared to have his own son crucified in Jesus' place. Then the text continues:

But Jesus said to Pilate: 'If I wished I would not come to this moment. Come, sit down and see that I am able to escape.' Pilate, then, looked at Jesus and, behold, he became incorporeal; he did not see him for a long time. After that Jesus came to him again. Pilate fainted but Jesus laid his hand upon him, and he rose and recovered his senses. Jesus said to him: 'Have you understood that if I wish I can escape?' Pilate said: 'Yes, my Lord.'

Jesus shows Pilate that he could easily withdraw from the present situation by becoming incorporeal and invisible, but that he does not want to do so. There is no need to assume that at this point the author transmits an early docetic or gnostic tradition.<sup>131</sup> It seems much more probable that a typically monophysite view of the body of Jesus forms the background of this story. Of course, we should not assume that Pseudo-Cyril had a detailed knowledge of the range of subtleties of later monophysite theology, but he seems to reflect here a view on the body of Christ that had been inaugurated by Julian of Halicarnassus (first decades of the sixth century). He taught that because of the hypostatic union of the divine Logos and the human nature of Jesus, which started at the incarnation, the body of Christ 'had been removed from the sphere of physical laws and exempted both from all suffering except that which the Word willed to endure, working a miracle to make this possible, and also from all possibility of corruption.'<sup>132</sup> The 'aphthartodocetics,' as the adherents of this type of Christology were called by their opponents (the equally monophysite Severus of Antioch and his school in particular), held that Christ's body had been completely absorbed into the divine nature and, for that reason, could neither suffer nor die. Nevertheless, Christ's suffering and death were real, but only because he wished to endure them.<sup>133</sup>

---

apolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007, 411–419, and also, with more emphasis on the Exodus story, C.A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 34B), Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001, 33–34.

<sup>131</sup> For the gnostic views on Jesus, see R. van den Broek, 'The Gnostic Christ,' in O. Hammer (ed.), *Alternative Christs*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 16–32, and idem, *Gnostic Religion in Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 188–205.

<sup>132</sup> G.W.H. Lampe, 'Christian Theology in the Patristic Period,' in H. Cunliffe-Jones (ed.), *A History of Christian Doctrine*, Edinburgh: T.&T. Clarke, 1978, 146.

<sup>133</sup> See also W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972, 253–254. For the roots of the aphthartodocetic view, *int. al.* in Apollinaris of Laodicea, see



These ideas are presupposed in §137 of Pseudo-Cyril's homily: by making it invisible, Jesus shows the superhuman nature of his body to Pontius Pilate and in this way demonstrates that he could evade the Passion if he wanted to do so, but that he was prepared to be crucified of his own free will.

There is still another passage in Pseudo-Cyril which speaks of Jesus' changing appearance. As Judas announces that he will deliver Jesus to the Jewish leaders, they say to him in §73:

How shall we arrest him, for he does not have a single shape but his appearance changes. Sometimes he is ruddy, sometimes he is white, sometimes he is red, sometimes he is wheat-coloured, sometimes he is pallid like ascetics, sometimes he is a youth, sometimes an old man, sometimes his hair is straight and black, sometimes it is curled, sometimes he is tall, sometimes he is short. In one word, we have never seen him in one and the same appearance.

Judas' answer follows in §75:

Since you said to me: 'We have never seen him in a single shape,' this is the sign which I shall give to those who will follow me: He whom I shall kiss on his mouth and embrace and to whom I shall say: 'Hail rabbi!,' he is your man. Arrest him!

In this passage, the author makes use of an old docetic idea to explain why Judas' perfidious kiss was needed: because of the variability of Jesus' body, the Jews could only recognize and arrest him after Judas had given them his treacherous sign. The same explanation of Judas' kiss is given in another sermon ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem that is also kept at the Pierpont Morgan Library, the unedited *Homily on the Resurrection and the Passion*. In this text it is said of Judas:

He had given them a sign, saying: 'The one whom I shall embrace and kiss is your man.' He, then, said this because they did not know him. For sometimes he is white, but another time he has the colour of wheat, sometimes he is a young man, another time he is a man of advanced age, sometimes his hair is curly, another time it is long, sometimes he speaks, another time he is silent, in short, he never permitted them to know him.<sup>134</sup>

---

A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II, 4. Aufl., Tübingen: Mohr, 1909 (reprinted Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), 410–412, and Lampe, *Lexicon*, 254, s.v. ἀσωματία and ἀσώματος, C.6.

<sup>134</sup> M595, fol. 10<sup>ro</sup> (p. 19), b, 11–32 (Facs. ed., vol. 43, 21b; also in M594, fol. 9<sup>ro</sup>–9<sup>vo</sup>, Facs. ed., vol. 42, 21b–22a): ἀϥτ δὲ ναγ ἰογῆαειν εϥχῶ ἴμος δὲ πετᾶμαρτε ἴμοϥ τατ π ερωϥ ἴτοϥ πε. ἵταϥδε παῖ δὲ δὲ νεγσοογῆ ἴμοϥ ἀν πε. ογσοπ μεν τᾶϥϥ ογῶβῳ ογσοπ δὲ οη ἵαγαν σογο ογσοπ ἵρῳρε κεσοπ ἵμερσοῖτε ἵγλῆκῖα ογσοπ ἵκαρογς κεσοπ ερεπεχῶ τῳ ογσοπ εϥῶαδὲ κεσοп εϥκῶ ἵρῶϥ. ϣαπαζ ϣαπλῶς εἰεϥκῶ ἴμοογ ἀν πε εσογῶνῳ. On this text, see pp. 81–87 below.

This explanation of Judas' kiss is first found in Origen. In his *Contra Celsum*, II, 64, Origen says that 'to those who saw him (sc. Jesus) he did not appear alike to all,' and 'his appearance was not just the same to those who saw him, but varied according to their individual capacity.'<sup>135</sup> For this he found some clear proofs in the Gospels: 'And it is clear that he did not always appear in the same form from the remark of Judas when about to betray him. For he said to the crowd that came with him, as though they did not know him (ὡς μὴ εἰδόσιν αὐτόν), "Whomsoever I kiss, it is he" (Matthew 26:48). I think that the Saviour himself also makes this point clear by the words, "I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and you laid no hand upon me" (Matthew 26:55):' And in the next sentence he says: 'we hold that Jesus was such a wonderful person, not only as to the divinity within him which was hidden from the multitude, but also as to his body which was transfigured when he wished and before whom he wished (κατὰ τὸ μεταμορφούμενον σῶμα, ὅτ' ἐβούλετο καὶ οἷς ἐβούλετο).'<sup>136</sup> The idea that Jesus appeared in different forms, even to people who saw him at the same time, is explained by Origen as depending on the spiritual capacity of the individual who saw him. The same view is found in the *Acts of Peter*, 20, when Peter says that 'each of us saw him as he was capable to see him, as far as he could.'<sup>137</sup> In the next chapter of these *Acts*, this is demonstrated through the healing of a few blind women by a heavenly light. Peter asks them what they have seen; some say 'an old man' (*seniorem*), others 'a young man' (*iuvensem adulescentem*), and some others 'a child' (*puerum*).<sup>138</sup> But originally, this polymorphous appearance of Jesus was an expression of the docetic idea that he did not possess a normal human body of flesh and blood, but only seemed to have one. It is also found in the long recension of the gnostic *Apocryphon of John*, NHC II, 2, 1–6, where John sees an appearance of Christ as a child, an old man and a young man.<sup>139</sup> And according to the *Acts of*

<sup>135</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum*, II, 64, ed. M. Marcovich, *Origenes: Contra Celsum, Libri VIII* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. LIV), Leiden: Brill, 2001, 134, 22 ff.: τοῖς βλέπουσιν οὐχ ὁμοίως πάντιν ὁρώμενος, ... καὶ βλέπομενος οὐχ ὡσαύτως τοῖς βλέπουσιν ἐφαίνετο, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐχώρουν οἱ βλέποντες. I here follow the translation by H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953, reprinted with corrections 1965, 115.

<sup>136</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum*, II, 64, ed. Marcovich, 135, 15 ff.

<sup>137</sup> *Acts of Peter* (or: *Actus Petri cum Simone*), 20 (ed. R.A. Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, I, Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891, reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959, 67): 'unusquisque enim nostrum sicut capiebat videre, prout poterat videbat.'

<sup>138</sup> *Acts of Peter*, 21 (ed. Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, I, 69).

<sup>139</sup> Waldstein & Wisse (eds), *The Apocryphon of John*, 17 (Synopsis 3, 3–12). Although the word 'child' is in a lacuna, it can be supplied from the short recension (Waldstein-Wisse, 16).

*John*, 88–89, Jesus appeared in different forms to James and John at their calling: as a child (παιδίον) and a young man with a first beard (ἀρχιγένειος νεανίσκος) to James, but to John as a ‘beautiful well-shaped man of a cheerful countenance’ (ἄνδρα εὖμορφον καλὸν ἱλαροπρόσωπον) and as ‘a man with a rather bald head and a thick flowing beard’ (ὕπόψιλον ἔχων <τὴν κεφαλὴν>, τὸ δὲ γένειον δασὺ καταγόμενον). And still later Jesus again appeared to John under different forms, *int. al.* as ‘a small man and unattractive and then again as one reaching to heaven’ (μικρὸς ἄνθρωπος ... δύσμορφος καὶ τὸ πᾶν εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀποβλέπων).<sup>140</sup>

Pseudo-Cyril’s report of the varying appearances of Jesus is to some degree reminiscent of the above-mentioned docetic and gnostic descriptions—sometimes a youth, sometimes an old man, sometimes tall, sometimes short—, but other elements seem to derive from traditional descriptions of Jesus’ external appearance that were partly influenced by the description of the bride-groom in the Song of Songs according to the Septuagint. These elements recur in the description of Jesus’ appearance before Pilate.

### 6. *The External Appearance of Jesus*

Pseudo-Cyril relates that as Jesus was brought before Pilate, the governor ‘looked at him for a long time, marveling at his beauty and his youth’ (§ 114). Then the text continues:

This is his appearance: he is corn-coloured, his hair is black, coming down to his shoulders like bunches of grapes, his nose is prominent, he has beautiful eyes, his eyebrows are joined together, his cheek are red like roses. He wears a

---

For ‘young man’ the Coptic texts uses the word ϣαλ, which means ‘servant, slave’ (Crum, *Dictionary*, 665a), but most probably this is the translation of νεανίσκος, ‘young man’ and ‘servant’ (Liddel-Scott, *Lexicon*, 1164a). In the short recension, only the child and the old man are mentioned; for an explanation, see G.G. Stroumsa, ‘Polymorphie divine et transformations d’un mythogème: L’Apocryphon de Jean et ses sources’ (1981), in idem, *Savoir et salut*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1992, 43–63.

<sup>140</sup> *Acts of John*, 88–89 (ed. E. Junod & J.-D. Kaestli, *Acta Johannis Textus alii—Commentarius—Indices* (CCA, 2), Turnhout: Brepols, 1983, 190–193). The translation given above (‘and again as one reaching to heaven’) is that of Elliott, *Apocrypha of the New Testament*, 317 (probably reading, with James, πάλιν instead of τὸ πᾶν); Junod & Kaestli, 192, translate: ‘tantôt faisant entièrement face au ciel.’ See also E. Junod, ‘Polymorphie du Dieu-Sauveur,’ in J. Ries (ed.), *Gnosticisme et Monde Hellénistique*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1982, 38–46, and P.J. Lalleman, ‘Polymorphy of Christ,’ in J.N. Bremmer (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of John*, Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1995, 97–118.

grape-coloured tunic, he has two silver-studded adornments on his side, like a sword, and a linen garment covers him so that he looks like a royal son. Thus they brought him to Pilate, the governor.

This description of the physical appearance of Jesus does not spring from Pseudo-Cyril's imagination, but reflects a rather constant Byzantine literary tradition. The relevant Greek and Latin sources for this tradition were assembled more than a century ago by Ernst von Dobschütz.<sup>141</sup> Of the Byzantine texts, the most important are the *Vita Deiparae* by Epiphanius Monachus (ca. 800–813 or later in the ninth century) and the *Epistula synodi orientalis ad Theophilum Imperatorem*, written in 836 by the bishops Christophorus of Alexandria, Job of Antioch, and Basilius of Jerusalem.<sup>142</sup> In the Latin West, the most extensive description of Jesus' physical appearance is to be found in the anonymous *Vita beate virginis Marie et Salvatoris Rhythmica*, written in the first half of the thirteenth century but based on older, also Byzantine, sources.<sup>143</sup> Another, still later, Latin text about Jesus' appearance is the *Letter of Lentulus*, allegedly written by a predecessor of Pilate (*habens officium in partibus Judeae Herodis regis*), but in fact a Latin work from the thirteenth or fourteenth century (with a strong indirect or direct Byzantine influence), which received its final form at the hands of a humanist of the fifteenth or sixteenth century.<sup>144</sup> As a matter of fact, every element of Pseudo-Cyril's description can be paralleled from these and a few other texts. These literary descriptions in their turn reflected earlier representations of Christ in paintings, mosaics and on coins. In the Byzantine period, Christ was represented either with long waving hair that came to or fell behind his shoulders and a full beard (Type A) or with short curly hair that left his ears free and a short curly beard (Type B). The origin and development of these two types of the iconography of Christ do not need to be discussed in this connection. It suffices to say that both types are already

<sup>141</sup> E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende* (TU, 18), Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899, 292\*\*–330\*\* (Beilage VII: Zur Prosopographie Christi).

<sup>142</sup> Textcritical editions of the passages on Christ's physical appearance in von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 302\*\* and 303l\*\*. In the following these editions are quoted. On Epiphanius Monachus and the *Synodal Letter*, see also H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. XII, Byzantinisches Handbuch II, 1) München: Beck, 1959, 513 and 496, respectively.

<sup>143</sup> *Vita beate virginis Marie et Salvatoris rhythmica*, 3148–3315, edited by A. Vögtlin in *Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins zu Stuttgart*, 180, Stuttgart: Literarischer Verein, 1888. The quotations in the following are from this edition.

<sup>144</sup> Edited with a long critical apparatus by von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 307\*\*–330\*\*, text on p. 219\*\*.

represented in icons in Saint Catherine's monastery at Mount Sinai dating from the sixth century.<sup>145</sup> The iconography of Type A, which had a Constantinopolitan provenance, became, with variants, dominant in Byzantine and Orthodox art, as Christ Pantocrator. Type B seems to have a Syrian and Palestinian background: Christ is already shown with curly hair and a short beard in the dedication miniature of the Rabula Codex (Syria, 568AD).<sup>146</sup> The same type is also represented on the lid of a small Egyptian box dating from ca. 550AD now in Berlin (State Museums), and in a fresco found in a burial-crypt at Abu Girgeh, near Alexandria in Egypt, which is dated as post-sixth-century.<sup>147</sup>

Justinian II (685–695 and 705–711), the first to introduce a representation of the human body of Christ on Byzantine coins, made use of both types. Under his first reign, in the years 692–695, the mints of Constantinople and other places issued a golden solidus (and other coins) showing an image of Christ with long hair and a full beard (Type A). During his second reign, in the years 706–711, the same mints issued a golden solidus showing a Christ with his hair arranged in a double row of curls upon his head, while his beard is short and curly (Type B).<sup>148</sup> It is of interest to note that in both cases the effigy of Christ is struck on the obverse of the coin and that of the emperor on the less important reverse. During the iconoclastic controversy these types were not represented on coins, but after the Reinstatement of the Images at least the first type reappeared on the coins of,

<sup>145</sup> K. Weitzmann, *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Icons*, Vol. I: *From the Sixth to the Tenth Century*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976, 13–15, No. B.1, Plates I–II, XXXIX–XLI (Type A), and 26–27, No B.6, Plates XI and LV (Type B). On the two types, see J.D. Breckenridge, *The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II (685–695, 705–711 A.D.)* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, 144), New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1959, 46–62, Pl. I, 5 and Pl. V, 30 (Type A), Pl. I, 7, 8, 9 and 10 and Pl. IX, 38 (Type B), and H. Belting, *Likeness and Presence. A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994, 133–139, with photographs of the Sinai icons on p. 136 (nr. 78, Type A) and 137 (Nr. 80, Type B).

<sup>146</sup> C. Cecchelli, G. Furlani & M. Salmi (eds.), *The Rabula Gospels. Facsimile Edition of the Miniatures of the Syriac Manuscript Plut. I, 56 in the Medicaean-Laurentian Library, edited and commented*, Olten & Lausanne: Urs Graf, 1959, fol. 14.a, and p. 27, 72 and 78; also Breckenridge, *Numismatic Iconography*, Pl. X, 40.

<sup>147</sup> K. Wessel, *Koptische Kunst. Die Spätantike in Ägypten*, Recklinghausen: Aurel Bongers, 1963, 183–184, Pl. XII. For the painting in Abu Girgeh, see Breckenridge, *Numismatic Iconography*, Pl. IX, 39.

<sup>148</sup> A full discussion of these coins and their theological and political background and influence is to be found in Breckenridge, *Numismatic Iconography*, 46–62, Pl. I, 5 and Pl. V, 30 (Type A), Pl. I, 7, 8, 9 and 10 and Pl. IX, 38 (Type B). See also P.D. Whitting, *Byzantine Coins*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1973, 35, no. 25 (Type A), 161, no. 246 (Type B).

*int. al.*, Michael III (842–867), Constantine VII (913–959), Basil II (976–1025), Michael IV (1034–1041) and Nicephorus III (1078–1081).<sup>149</sup>

Pseudo-Cyril starts his description by saying that Pilate looked at Jesus for a long time, ‘marveling at his beauty and youth.’ According to Epiphanius Monachus, Jesus’ general appearance was ‘very beautiful’ (ὡραῖος τῇ ὀψει σφόδρα), for which he referred to Psalm 44:3 LXX: ὡραῖος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. The same is said in the *Vita rhythmica*, 3124–3127 (*Sicut in virtutibus erat adornatus, / Jesus ita corpore fuit decoratus. / Pre filiis nam hominum forma speciosus / dilectus hic apparuit, et vultu gratiosus*) and the *Letter of Lentulus* (*speciosus forma prae filiis hominum or speciosus inter filios hominum*).

That Christ’s skin was ‘wheat-coloured’ (ἡμογενεογο<sup>150</sup> = σιτόχρους, σιτόχροιος, σιτεύχρους) is also found in Epiphanius Monachus (σιτόχρους), in the *Synodal Letter to Theophilus* (σιτόχροιον τῷ εἶδει) and in an anonymous homily on an image of the Virgin Mary in Rome dating from around AD 1000 (σιτεύχροον).<sup>151</sup> In the story about Jesus’ changing appearance (§ 72 and M595, fol 10<sup>ro</sup>),<sup>152</sup> the colour of wheat (ἀγαν κογο) is also mentioned, together with white (οὐρανῶ, in § 73 and M595), ruddy, red and pallid (μερῶ, ρεωρῶ and ογετογῶτ, § 73 only). It seems that all these colours of the changing Jesus refer to his skin, in particular his face, for the colour of his hair is mentioned separately in all passages concerned. The colour white is not mentioned in von Dobschütz’s Byzantine texts, but it occurs in the Western descriptions, which were strongly influenced by the Greek tradition.<sup>153</sup> Moreover, the traditional descriptions of Jesus were apparently also influenced by that of the bridegroom in the Song of Songs, of whom it is said in 5:10 LXX that he is ‘white and ruddy’ (Ἀδελφιδός μου λευκός καὶ πυρρός). According to Pseudo-Cyril’s description in § 114, Jesus’ cheek are ‘red like roses,’ for which he uses

<sup>149</sup> Breckenridge, *Numismatic Iconography*, 47 and Pl. V, 31 and 32 (Michael III); Whitting, *Byzantine Coins*, 174, no. 271 (Michael III), 183, no. 291 (Constantine VII), 21, no. 15 (Basil II), 287, no. 455 (Michael IV) and 37, no. 41 (Nicephorus III).

<sup>150</sup> For the word ἡογνε see Crum, *Dictionary*, 174a, who noted: ‘meaning unknown,’ but also referred to this passage and to ἀγαν κογο in § 72 and in M595, fol. 10<sup>ro</sup> (quoted above p. 54, n. 134), and concluded: ‘so? colour’.

<sup>151</sup> Edited by von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 233\*\*–266\*\*, the description of Christ is on p. 246f.\*\*.

<sup>152</sup> See p. 54, n. 134.

<sup>153</sup> According to the *Vita beate virginis*, 3134–3139, his skin is milk- and lily-white and a little reddish because of the sun: ‘Cutis sui corporis lactei coloris / fuit atque candidi lilii candoris. / Tamen aliquantulum ipsum per ardorem / sol decoloraverat maiorem ad decorem. / In eo sol rubedinem modicam paravit, / quae iuncta cum albedine plus ipsum decoravit.’

the same word (ρεωρῶα, 'red') as in §73. Of the Byzantine texts quoted above, the *Vitae Deiparae* of Epiphanius Monachos is the only one that says that Christ's face was ὀλίγον ἐπιφοινισσομένην, 'a little reddish,' but the same is found in the Latin tradition. The *Vita beate virginis*, 3184, says that his cheeks are 'white mingled with red' (*candide sed roseo consparse cum colore*), while the *Letter of Lentulus* asserts that his face was 'without any wrinkle or stain, embellished by a slightly reddish complexion' (*cum facie sine ruga et macula aliqua, quam rubor moderatus venustat*).

According to Pseudo-Cyril, Christ appeared before Pilate with long black hair falling down to his shoulders. That the colour of his hair was at times black is also mentioned in the passage on Jesus' changing appearance, in §73: 'sometimes his hair is ... black.' In the Byzantine texts his hair is often said to be more or less 'yellow,' i.e. fair: ἐπιξανθον and (of his beard) ἐπιξανθίζων (Epiphanius Monachus), ξανθὴν ὀλίγον (*Homily on the Picture of the Virgin*). The *Synodal Letter*, however, explicitly says that Jesus' beard was black (γενειάδα μέλαιναν ἔχοντα), and we may assume that the same was thought about his hair in general. The passage on the varying forms of Jesus' body, in §73, states: 'sometimes his hair is straight and black (ερεπεφω ολῖ εκκημ), sometimes it is curly (καρογς).' In the corresponding section in M595 it is claimed: 'sometimes his hair is curly (καρογς), sometimes it is long.' The first part of the remark in §73 reflects the description of the bridegroom in Song of Songs 5:11 LXX: βόστρυχοι αὐτοῦ ἐλάται, μέλανες ὡς κόραξ, 'his locks are spathes of the date-palm, raven-black,' i.e. his locks are compared to the spathes which enclose the blossoms or the developing fruits of the date-palm.<sup>154</sup> This comparison was translated in the Sahidic version as: νεφω ετολῖ,<sup>155</sup> which asks for some comment. The stative or qualitative form ολῖ, of the verb ωλ(ε)μ, is often used to characterize a person's hair.<sup>156</sup> In Judith 10:3 it is said that in order to make herself as

<sup>154</sup> Lampe, *Lexicon*, 445 s.v. ἐλάτη, with reference to *int. al.* Origen, *Scholia in Canticum Canticorum*, ad 5:11 (PG 17, 273D), who says that the locks are compared to the spathes of the palm because of their thickness. That the ἐλάτη could also indicate the capsule of the developing fruit at the acme of the bloom of the date-palm is already said by Dioscurides (first century AD), *De materia medica*, I, 109, 4 (ed. M. Wellmann, *Pedani Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1907, 102): φοῖνιξ, ὅν ἐνιοι ἐλάτην ἢ σπάθην καλοῦσι, περιβάλλυμμά ἐστι τοῦ καρποῦ τῶν φοινίκων ἀκμὴν ἀνθοῦντων.

<sup>155</sup> H. Thompson, *The Coptic Version of Certain Books of the Old Testament*, London: H. Frowde—Oxford University Press, 1908, 52.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. Crum, *Dictionary*, 522b, who translates ωλ(ε)μ as 'clasp, embrace, entwine' and takes φω ετολῖ as the translation of βόστρυχος ἐλατός. He apparently assumed that in Song of Songs 5:11, the Coptic translator read ἐλατοῖ instead of ἐλάται, but ἐλατός means 'ductile' or 'beaten'

beautiful as possible before going to Holophernes, Judith *int. al.*, ‘did (lit. ‘carded,’ i.e. combed and did up) the hair of her head’: διέξανε τὰς τρίχας τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς, which in Coptic translations is rendered as ⲁⲙⲱⲱ ⲙⲡⲱⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲁⲡⲉ, ‘she made straight the hair of her head,’<sup>157</sup> but also as ⲁⲥⲱⲗⲁ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲁⲱ ⲉⲧⲱⲗⲙ, ‘she braided her hair that was combed,’ which may be a correct interpretation of διέξανε.<sup>158</sup> Hair that is ⲱⲗⲙ is hair that is (made) straight (and can be done up), and as such it is the opposite of curly hair. The Coptic translation of βόστρουχοι αὐτοῦ ἐλάται, ‘his locks are spathes of the date-palm,’ in Song of Songs 5:11 as ⲛⲉⲙⲙⲱ ⲉⲧⲱⲗⲙ, ‘his hair is straight,’ is obviously not a literary but an interpretative translation, conceivably based on the straight strings of encapsuled dates.<sup>159</sup> According to our text, the long black hair of Jesus came down to his shoulders, ‘like bunches of grapes,’ which probably indicates that his thick locks ended in a slight curl. Epiphanius Monachus, who also attributed long hair to Jesus (μακρὰν ἔχων τὴν τρίχα) apparently had a similar idea in mind, as he wrote that Jesus’ hair inclined to be curly (τὴν τρίχα ... πρὸς τὸ οὐλον ἀποκλίνουσιν). The same idea may already have been expressed by Antoninus of Piacenza (ca. 570), *Itinerarium*, 23, as he said that Jesus’ hair was ‘slightly curled’ (capillos subanellatos).<sup>160</sup> It is clearly expressed in the *Vita beate virginis Marie et Salvatoris rhythmica*, 3148–3151, which says that Jesus’ black, soft and long hair was slightly twisted, rarely combed, never shaven, but nevertheless not disturbed:

Nigri sui capitis fueruntque capilli  
Molles et non rigidi, longi satis illi,  
Propter longitudinem modicum retorti,  
Raro compti, numquam tonsi, tamen non distorti.

The same view is found in the *Letter of Lentulus*, which describes Jesus’ hair as having the colour of the ripe hazelnut, ‘straight down to the ears, but below the ears wavy and curled, with a bluish and bright reflection, flowing over his shoulders, with a parting in the middle of his head in the

---

and is commonly used of metals; an association with hair, in the sense of ‘not curly,’ is not attested.

<sup>157</sup> H. Thompson, *A Coptic Palimpsest Containing Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith and Esther*, London: H. Frowde—Oxford University Press, 1911, 308.

<sup>158</sup> See Crum, *Dictionary*, 522b, who refers to Ms Borgianus 258, 103.

<sup>159</sup> But see also Crum’s interpretation in note 156 above.

<sup>160</sup> Edited by P. Geyer, *Itinera Hierosolymitana, saeculi IIII–VIII* (CSEL, 39), Vienna: Temp-sky, 1898, 175 and 206 (second recension: capillo subanelato). Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 306\*\*.



manner of the Nazarenes' (*capillos ... planos fere usque ad aures, ab auribus circinos crispas aliquantulum ceruliores et fulgentiores, ab humeris ventilantes, discrimen habens in medio capitis iuxta morem Nazareorum*). The comparison of Jesus' hair with 'bunches of grapes' (ἵθε ἡμισμαζ ἡελοολε) is unique and might be due to a Greek scribal error or a Coptic mistranslation. The Greek equivalent of the Coptic expression is the word βοτρυσειδής, 'like a bunch of grapes,' but it seems probable that originally the word βοστρυχοειδής, 'curly,' 'like curls,' was used. An anonymous description of Jesus' physical appearance of ca. 950—obviously based on the prevalent image of Christ as Pantocrator—also says that Jesus had long hair that was drawn back with a parting in the middle: τὴν κόμην μέγας καὶ συνεσταλμένος θριξί ... διχῇ πρὸς τὸ μέτωπον τοὺς πλοκάμους διεσταλμένος.<sup>161</sup> However, the view that Jesus had short curly hair found also frequent expression. Theodorus Anagnostes (ca. AD 530) already asserted in his *Church History* (ca. AD 530) that according to the most reliable tradition, Jesus' hair had been curly and short: τὸ ἄλλο σχῆμα τοῦ σωτῆρος, τὸ οὖλον καὶ ὀλιγότριχον, ὑπάρχει τὸ ἀληθέστερον,<sup>162</sup> and that it was curly is repeated in the *Synodal Letter* (οὐλότριχα) and in the *Homily on the Picture of the Virgin* (οὐλότριχον τὴν κεφαλὴν).

Pseudo-Cyril says of Jesus' face: 'his nose is prominent (ἄορε), he has beautiful eyes (ἡσαιν ἡβαλ), his eyebrows are joined together (τῆς ἐνεγεργη). These three characteristics are also mentioned together in the *Synodal Letter* of AD 836: σύνοφρυν, εὐόφθαλμον, ἐπίρρινον ('with meeting eyebrows, beautiful eyes and a prominent (or: long) nose'). In the *Homily on the Picture of the Virgin* of around AD 1000, the 'prominent nose' has become a 'beautiful nose,' which is virtually the same: his ἰδίωμα is εὐοφρυ καὶ τοῦτο συνδεδεμένον, εὐόφθαλμον, εὐρινον ('with beautiful eyebrows and that joined together [cf. Pseudo-Cyril], with beautiful eyes and a beautiful nose'). Two of these expressions are already found in a treatise on the cult of the icons by Andrew of Crete (ca. 700): the Jew (Flavius) Josephus is said to have seen Jesus as being, *int. al.*, σύνοφρυν, εὐόφθαλμον,<sup>163</sup> and also in Epiphanius Monachus: εὐόφθαλμος, ἐπίρρινος. The word ἐπίρρινος also occurs in the anonymous description of Jesus' appearance of about AD 950.<sup>164</sup> Because of

<sup>161</sup> Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 305\*\*. See also the *Letter of Lentulus*, quoted above.

<sup>162</sup> Theodorus Anagnostes, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Frg. 11—Epitome 382 (ed. G. Hansen, *Theodorus Anagnostes: Kirchengeschichte* (GCS), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1971, 107); Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 107\*.

<sup>163</sup> Andrew of Crete, *De sanctorum imaginum veneratione*, PG 97, 1304C; von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 186\*, 33 ff.

<sup>164</sup> Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 305\*\*.

the frequent occurrence of this word we may safely assume that the parallel expression in Pseudo-Cyril,  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\omega\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\bar{\iota}\ \chi\omicron\sigma\epsilon$ , is simply the translation of  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\rho\rho\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>165</sup> This word, together with  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\phi\rho\upsilon\varsigma$ , is also used in the description of Paul's face in the *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, 3:  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\phi\rho\upsilon\nu$ ,  $\mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\rho\rho\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ .<sup>166</sup> In this case it is mostly translated as 'with eyebrows joining, and nose somewhat hooked',<sup>167</sup> which suggest that he had what is called a 'high bridge nose.' The word  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\rho\rho\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is usually translated as 'with a long nose' or 'with a prominent nose',<sup>168</sup> but this does not imply a contradiction with a hooked nose, at least not in the case of Christ, who is commonly represented on icons as having a long thin nose with the suggestion of a high bridge.

Finally, something must be said of Jesus' clothing as he was standing before Pilate. The passage which describes his apparel is one of the most difficult in Pseudo-Cyril's homily. The author says that Christ looked like a prince, 'a royal son,' and it may be assumed that the description can not entirely be attributed to the imagination of Pseudo-Cyril or his source, but that in this case, too, the portrayal reflects existing representations of royal princes or high court dignitaries. Christ's tunic is 'grape-coloured' ( $\delta\gamma\alpha\nu\ \tilde{\eta}\epsilon\lambda\omicron\omicron\lambda\epsilon$ ), which might be another term for 'purple,' the colour that was reserved for the imperial family in Byzantium. But this is by no means certain, for the term is not attested elsewhere in this sense.

The description of what is probably the adornment of the tunic is also problematic, because the meaning of some words is uncertain. The manuscript reads:  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\iota\gamma\mu\alpha\ \sigma\eta\delta\gamma\ \tilde{\eta}\alpha\gamma\rho\omicron\gamma\lambda\lambda\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \gamma\iota\omega\omega\gamma\ \gamma\iota\chi\epsilon\nu\ \gamma\tau\eta\gamma\ \tilde{\eta}\theta\epsilon\ \tilde{\eta}\omicron\gamma\sigma\pi\alpha\theta\alpha$ . Since the word  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$  forms the beginning of a new independent sentence, it requires the pronominal prefix  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ -, which is now missing, apparently due to a scribal error: ( $\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ ) $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$ . The word  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$  is the Coptic form of Greek  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$ , 'display, showpiece, gaud.' Most probably the word is used here to indicate the adornments of the tunic, which are said to be  $\alpha\gamma\rho\omicron\gamma\lambda\lambda\epsilon$ . The unknown word  $\alpha\gamma\rho\omicron\gamma\lambda\lambda\epsilon$  is most probably a corrupted form of a Greek word, though even this is far from certain. With much hesitation, I suggest to read it as a distorted form of  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\gamma\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ , 'silver-studded' (which,

<sup>165</sup> Crum, *Dictionary*, 544a, s.v.  $\omega\lambda$ , suggested that it is the translation of  $\mu\alpha\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\rho\rho\upsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$  (incorrectly spelled by him), which, however, means 'long-beaked' (Liddell & Scott, 1075a).

<sup>166</sup> Ed. Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, I, 237.

<sup>167</sup> James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 273; Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 364: 'with eyebrows meeting, rather hook-nosed'; W. Schneemelcher, in idem (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, II: *Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*, 3. Aufl., Tübingen: Mohr, 1964, 243: 'mit zusammengewachsenen Augenbrauen und ein klein wenig hervortretender Nase.'

<sup>168</sup> Liddell & Scott, *Lexicon*, 654b s.v. and Lampe, *Lexicon*, 530b s.v., respectively.

however, seems to occur in Homer only) or, less probable, ἀργυρήλατος, 'of wrought silver'.<sup>169</sup> The following words are also problematic: the adornments are εἰχεν ῥτην, 'on its edge (i.e. of the tunic), like a σπαῶν' or 'on his side (i.e. of Jesus), like a σπαῶν.' In Coptic documentary papyri the word σπαῶα or σπαῶη seems to indicate 'a decorative stripe on a textile'.<sup>170</sup> Then the translation would be: 'He has (lit.: wears) two silver-studded adornments on its edge, like a decorative stripe (or: clavus).' However, one of the more common meanings of the Greek word σπάθη is 'sword,' and it is quite possible that it was this meaning which Pseudo-Cyril or his source had in mind. In view of the strong Byzantine influence on the entire description of Jesus' appearance, this seems a very likely possibility. If the author indeed thought of silver adornments of the tunic, in the form of embroidery or otherwise, which looked like a sword, we have to translate: 'He has two silver-studded adornments on his side, like a sword.' That such adornments really existed can already be seen in the famous mosaic of Justinian I and his retinue in the church of San Vitale at Ravenna, dedicated in AD 547. Fastened to Justinian's tunica is a broad golden strip with a knob, which looks like a sword. Another late example of the same adornment is shown on the tunic of a military martyr in a mosaic of the Kariye Camii church (1315–1320) at Istanbul.<sup>171</sup> According to Pseudo-Cyril, Jesus wore a white linen garment over his tunic, which must have been the white dalmatic which was usually worn by high dignitaries, as can be seen in the Byzantine mosaics and paintings.<sup>172</sup>

Based on the above, we can conclude that Pseudo-Cyril's description of Jesus' physical appearance was strongly influenced by the literary tradition to be found in the Byzantine texts quoted above and that it corresponded to the prevalent representation of Christ as a man with long black hair. As for his clothing, which is not described in the literary sources, the author seems to have been influenced by images of high ranking people in existing mosaics or paintings.

<sup>169</sup> Liddell & Scott, *Lexicon*, 236 a/b s.v.

<sup>170</sup> Thus Förster, *Wörterbuch*, 742 s.v.: 'Streifen als Verzierung eines Gewebes,' but his examples are not fully convincing.

<sup>171</sup> A good picture is to be found on the internet: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Meister\\_der\\_Kahriye-Cami-Kirche\\_in\\_Istanbul\\_002.jpg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Meister_der_Kahriye-Cami-Kirche_in_Istanbul_002.jpg).

<sup>172</sup> See for instance Justinian's retinue of high officials in the mosaic of San Vitale in Ravenna.

7. *Moses the Prophet-Killer*

In connection with the arrest of Jesus, Pseudo-Cyril relates how Peter, ‘a hotheaded, grey-haired man’ (§ 99), tried to kill the servant of the High Priest, but only managed to cut off his ear.<sup>173</sup> Peter himself explains why he wanted to behead the servant: ‘When I strike this one, it is as if I have struck his master, for he seeks to kill Jesus more than the rest of the Jews’ (§ 100). As Christ did not want Peter to become a murderer, he disposed that not the servant’s head but only his ear was cut off. Thanks to Christ Peter did not kill the servant. Apparently it was inconceivable to Pseudo-Cyril that the Prince of the Apostles might have been a common murderer, leading him to recapitulate the tale about another holy man who allegedly committed murder, Moses. The text continues (§ 102):

You know, o my beloved sons, that no murder occurred in this fight. But look at the hierophant Moses: when he struck the Egyptian he actually struck him with a papyrus scroll, and he died. How many times the devil has quarreled with the archangel about this event, and, behold, until the present day the devil calls him the prophet-killer, although it is not with a sword that he struck him but with a papyrus.

That Moses slew the Egyptian (Exodus 2:11–15), has always been a slight embarrassment to both Jews and Christians. In his work *On the Jews*, the Jewish historian Artapanus (between 250 and 100 BC) put the story into a non-biblical context—a conspiracy against Moses—and explained the killing as self-defence.<sup>174</sup> Flavius Josephus passed over the incident in silence in his *Antiquitates Judaearum*, II, 255, apparently because he found it too hard to deal with. Clement of Alexandria gives in his *Stromateis* I, 151–157, a short survey of Moses’ life, in which he, *int. al.*, cites the Jewish historian, Eupolemus (ca. 158/157 BC), who in his work called *On the Kings in Judea* asserted ‘that Moses was the first wise man and that he had transmitted the alphabet to the Jews and that the Phoenicians had received it from the Jews and the Greeks from the Phoenicians’ (153, 4). The quotation is also known

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Mark 14:47; Matthew 26:51–54; Luke 22:49–51; John 18:10–11. John is the only Evangelist who gives the servant a name, Malchus, and who says that it was Peter who drew his sword.

<sup>174</sup> Artapanus, *Peri Ioudaiōn*, Fragm. 3, in Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, IX, 27, 18; English translation, with introduction and notes, by J.J. Collins, ‘Artapanus,’ in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, 889–903. Eusebius does not quote Artapanus’ work directly but only the summaries made by Alexander Polyhistor, who wrote in the middle of the first century BC.

through Eusebius,<sup>175</sup> but Clement adds some remarks that are of interest in this connection. He says that Moses had such a zeal for the culture of his people and his ancestors that he went as far as to strike and kill the Egyptian who unwarrantably attacked the Jew (153, 5), but then continues by saying (154, 1): 'The initiates say that it was by his word alone that he killed the Egyptian (Φασὶ δὲ οἱ μύσται λόγῳ μόνῳ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον), just as later on Peter in Acts (5:1–12) is said to have killed by his word the people who had kept back part of the price of the land and had lied.<sup>176</sup> The 'initiates' (μύσται) are apparently a specific class of Christians who had a deeper religious knowledge than ordinary believers. According to *Stromateis* I, 32, 4, they have discovered the true philosophy, 'or rather they have received it from the Truth itself' (i.e. Christ). They also knew that in heaven, after his assumption, Moses was given a third name, Melchi (I, 153, 1). By postulating that the Egyptian died from the words of Moses, the 'initiates' obviously wanted to avoid having to come to terms with the idea that Moses had killed a man by his own hands. In the Jewish tradition, the problem was solved in a similar way: some rabbis taught that Moses merely pronounced the holy Name of God, whereupon the Egyptian died immediately.<sup>177</sup>

In Pseudo-Cyril we have another attempt to exculpate Moses from the charge of murder: he only struck the Egyptian with a χαρτης. In Coptic documentary papyri, the Greek word χάρτης means 'document,' 'letter' or 'papyrus.'<sup>178</sup> We may assume that a papyrus scroll is meant here, which indeed is a very unlikely lethal weapon. It would seem that the author

<sup>175</sup> Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, IX, 9, 26, 1 = Eupolemus, *Fragm.* 1; English translation of the fragments, with introduction and notes, by F. Fallon, 'Eupolemus,' in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, 861–872 (*Fragm.* 1 on p. 865). Clement and Eusebius are both dependent on the summary by Alexander Polyhistor also in this case.

<sup>176</sup> A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graece* (*Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece*, III), Leiden: Brill, 1970, 64, takes the words λόγῳ μόνῳ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον as a quotation from the *Assumption of Moses*, but I cannot see any reason which would justify this assumption. J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary* (*Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha*, X), Leiden: Brill, 1993, 271–272, has rightly rejected it.

<sup>177</sup> See, *int. al.*, *Midrash Rabba—Exodus* I, 29 (transl. S.M. Lehman, *Midrash Rabbah—Exodus*, London & Bournemouth: Soncino Press, 1951, 37): 'The rabbis say that he pronounced God's name against him and thus he slew him'; another attempt to exculpate Moses is, *int. al.*, found in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, ad 2:12 (*The Aramaic Bible*, Vol. 2; transl. M. Maher, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994, 165): 'And Moses, in the wisdom of his mind, looked and considered every generation, and saw that no proselyte would arise from that Egyptian, and that no one from his children's children would ever repent.'

<sup>178</sup> See Förster, *Wörterbuch*, 867–868; cf. also Liddell-Scott, *Lexicon*, 1980b, s.v.; Lampe, *Lexicon*, 1519b, s.v.

also used the word 'papyrus' itself in this connection. He concludes the passage on Moses by saying: 'it is not with a sword that he struck him, but with an ἀπῆρ.' The last word, which in this form is neither Coptic nor Greek, is most likely a mutilated form of παπῆρ or παπῆρος, 'papyrus'.<sup>179</sup> Since papyrus was a typically Egyptian product that was very frequently used for writing, Pseudo-Cyril's exoneration of Moses may have an Egyptian origin as well. He might have invented this excuse himself, as it is not to be found in other sources, but it seems more probable that he found it in connection with another story about Moses: the dispute between Michael and the devil about Moses' dead body. He reminds his hearers of this dispute by saying: 'How many times the devil has quarreled with the archangel about this event, and, behold, until the present day the devil calls him the prophet-killer, although it is not with a sword that he struck him but with a papyrus.'

The tradition that the archangel Michael and Satan fought over the body of Moses derives from the *Assumption of Moses*, a Jewish apocryphal work dating from the first quarter of the first century AD.<sup>180</sup> According to Origen, this work was already referred to and quoted in Jude 9.<sup>181</sup> According to Jude, there are people in the church who 'pervert the free favour of our God into licentiousness, disowning Jesus Christ, our only Master and Lord' (4). 'Their dreams lead them to defile the body, to flout authority, and to insult celestial beings (δόξας)' (8). In contrast, the author points to the example of Michael, who refused even to address the devil in insulting, blasphemous

<sup>179</sup> The form παπῆρ or παπῆρος (πάπυρος) is attested in a Coptic documentary papyrus that is dated to the beginning of the eighth century, Pap. London 1631<sup>vo</sup> col. 3.10; see H.I. Bell (ed.), *The Aphrodito Papyri, with an Appendix of Coptic Papyri, edited by W.E. Crum* (Greek Papyri in the British Museum. Catalogue, with Texts, vol. IV), London: British Museum, 1910, 516. Crum printed the line as: σναγ [ῆ]σιμα [ῆ]παπῆρ[ος], but commented in a note to line 10: 'Instead of final [ος], perhaps nothing.' So it seems possible that in Pseudo-Cyril, too, παπῆρ was the original spelling of the word 'papyrus.' Förster, *Wörterbuch*, 608, refers to the London papyrus, but does not mention the possibility that παπῆρ might be the correct reading.

<sup>180</sup> The Latin text was edited, with introduction, translation and commentary, by Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*.

<sup>181</sup> Origen, *De principiis*, III, 2, 1 (ed. H. Görgemanns & H. Karpp, *Origenes: Vier Bücher von den Prinzipien*, [Texte zur Forschung, 24], Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976, 261): 'de quo serpente in Ascensione Moysi, cuius libelli meminit in epistula sua apostolus Judas, Michahel archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Moysi ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae.' A passage in Clement of Alexandria's *Adumbrationes in Epistulam Judae* is also often read als a confirmation of the reference to the *Assumption of Moses* in Jude, but it is more likely that Clement saw in Jude 9 a confirmation that Moses had been taken up into heaven; see Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 273–274.

words: 'In contrast, when the archangel Michael was in debate with the devil, disputing the possession of Moses' body, he did not presume to condemn him in insulting words, but said: "May the Lord rebuke you"' (9).<sup>182</sup> Unfortunately, the ending of the *Assumption*, which must have contained the story of Moses' death, has not survived, which has opened a broad field for speculation. The last word of Jude 9 ('May the Lord rebuke you') are generally taken to be a quotation from the *Assumption of Moses*, although they ultimately derive from Zechariah 3:2. In Zechariah 3:2–5, Satan accuses the priest Joshua before the Angel of the Lord of sins, symbolized by the filthy clothes he is wearing. This makes it likely that the sins of Moses, and especially the murder of the Egyptian, formed at least one of the topics of the dispute between Michael and the devil in the *Assumption* as well.<sup>183</sup> According to later exegetical traditions on Jude 9, the devil claimed the body of Moses when Michael came to bury it. In this connection, we need not discuss these traditions in detail, but some witnesses must be mentioned.<sup>184</sup> In a commentary on Jude, Pseudo-Oecumenius explains that the devil contested Michael's right to give Moses an honourable burial and for that reason charged him with the murder of the Egyptian (ἐπιφέροντος ἔγκλημα διὰ τὸν τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου φόνον).<sup>185</sup> The *Catenae*, collections of Greek exegetical material, have preserved a tradition that Michael's words ('May the Lord rebuke you') were provoked by the fact that the devil used insulting language against Moses and called him 'a murderer' because he had

<sup>182</sup> The relationship between Jude 9 and the dispute between Michael and the devil in the *Assumption of Moses* has been dealt with in many commentaries on the Letter of Jude, most extensively in R.J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 50), Waco (Texas): Word Books, 1983, 65–76; see also, Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 275–281.

<sup>183</sup> Thus Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 70 and Tromp, 280. In a more recent study, however, Tromp has argued that 'it is very unlikely that the author of the *As. Mos.* would have brought Moses' errors into discussion. The stature of the prophet in the eyes of the author is so high (see especially 1:16–18) that it can be ruled out that the biblical reports about Moses' sins were a point of even the slightest interest to him,' in J. Tromp, 'Origen on the Assumption of Moses,' in F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen (eds.), *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 82), Leiden: Brill, 2003, 323–340 (quotation on p. 232).

<sup>184</sup> The tradition in the Greek *Catenae* that the devil claimed the body of Moses because he was the 'master of matter' (ὅτι ἐμὸν τὸ σῶμα ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπότης) is not of interest here; cf. Denis, *Fragmenta*, 67; Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 277–278 (from the same catena as mentioned on p. 69, n. 186).

<sup>185</sup> Text in Denis, *Fragmenta*, 67; the same tradition in the *Palaea historica*, a history of the Old Testament from Adam to Daniel, which adds that the devil, called Samael, wanted to bring Moses' body to the Israelites so that they would make him a god! (see Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 279–280).

slain the Egyptian (τοῦ διαβόλου κατὰ τοῦ Μωυσέως βλασφημοῦντος καὶ φονέα ἀναγορεύοντος διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον).<sup>186</sup> It is also asserted in a Slavonic story about Moses that the devil tried to prevent Michael from burying Moses' body, saying: 'Moses is a murderer, he slew a man in Egypt and hid him in the sand.'<sup>187</sup> The tradition that the devil called Moses a murderer was also known to Pseudo-Cyril, as appears from his remark: 'until the present day the devil calls him the prophet-killer (or: the murderous prophet, πῆρο-φῆτης ἡρερωτῆ).'. The word ῥερωτῆ, 'murderer,' is the Coptic equivalent of Greek φονεύς (e.g. Matthew 22:7; Revelation 22:15).<sup>188</sup> Of course, it can be argued that the later reports about the details of the dispute between Michael and the devil are no more than attempts to answer the exegetical questions that were raised by Judas' brief reference. Nevertheless, it is quite possible and even probable that already in the *Assumption of Moses* the devil objected to a decent burial of Moses' body on the ground that Moses was guilty of murder and that he explicitly called him a murderer. As we saw above, Pseudo-Cyril seems to follow a special Egyptian tradition (Moses struck the Egyptian with a papyrus scroll), but that the devil explicitly called Moses a 'killer,' or, according to Pseudo-Cyril, even the 'prophet-killer,' may be an element ultimately deriving from the *Assumption of Moses* itself.

## 8. Date

The homily *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* contains enough internal evidence to exclude a date of composition before the eighth century AD. One of its sources was a list of the apostles which also contained the names of Mark, Luke and Paul (§ 11). This expansion of the collegium of the apostles is first found in the highly influential list of Pseudo-Epiphanius, dating from the beginning or the middle of the eighth century.<sup>189</sup> As argued above, Pseudo-Cyril presents us with an abridged form of a late list which also contained the names of the apostles' parents, birthplaces and worldly professions. This list

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Denis, *Fragmenta*, 67; J.A. Cramer (ed.), *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, VIII: *In Epistolas Catholicas et Apocalypsin*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1844, 163 (on Jude 10).

<sup>187</sup> German translation by N. Bonwetsch, 'Die Mosessage in der slavischen kirchlichen Literatur,' *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philos.-Hist. Klasse, 1908, 607; also in H. Windisch-H. Preisker, *Die Katholischen Briefe*, 3. stark umgearbeitete Aufl. (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 15), Tübingen: Mohr, 1951, 43.

<sup>188</sup> Crum, *Dictionary*, 724a.

<sup>189</sup> See above p. 14.



seems to be an Egyptian production (as the substitution of the Egyptian Greek word *πωμαρίτης* for the Graeco-Coptic word *κωμαρίτης* suggests) and it must be later than Pseudo-Epiphanius, although it might still have been composed in the course of the eighth century. This conclusion is not contradicted by the fact that patriarch Benjamin of Alexandria, probably in 642, asserted that Bartholomew was a gardener who sold greens, as this description of Bartholomew apparently derives from an isolated earlier Egyptian tradition which was adopted into the list of the apostles.<sup>190</sup> Since the author of *On the Life and Passion of Christ* made use of a more advanced form of this list, it seems reasonable to assume that he cannot have written his work before the latter half of the eighth century.

A second indication of the date of composition of Pseudo-Cyril's *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* is provided by the elaborate descriptions of Jesus' physical appearance, in §§ 73 and 114. These passages presuppose the various and often conflicting Greek descriptions of Jesus to be found in such writings as the *Vita Deiparae* by Epiphanius Monachus (beginning or first half of the ninth century) and the *Synodal Letter* of 836.<sup>191</sup> Of course, it can be argued that these writings simply transmit traditions that were already in existence, which is certainly true: the two types of the iconography of Christ and descriptions of his external appearance are already attested in the sixth century.<sup>192</sup> But Pseudo-Cyril's combination of so many different aspects is only understandable if he or his source had access to the full descriptions that are found in written sources like those mentioned earlier. In the Byzantine world, these extensive descriptions begin to appear from the beginning of the ninth century onwards. Even if we assume that Pseudo-Cyril made use of earlier documents of this kind (of whose existence we know nothing), the date of composition of *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* cannot have been much earlier than the latter half of the eighth century. It seems more reasonable, however, to assign the work to the first half of the ninth century, after the appearance of the full descriptions of Jesus.

---

<sup>190</sup> See pp. 26–27.

<sup>191</sup> See p. 57.

<sup>192</sup> See pp. 57–59 and the references to Antoninus of Piacenza and Theodorus Anagnostes on pp. 61 and 62.

## CHAPTER THREE

### ON THE LIFE AND THE PASSION OF CHRIST AND THE OTHER COPTIC HOMILIES ATTRIBUTED TO CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

#### 1. *Eight Cyrillian Homilies*<sup>1</sup>

Cyril of Jerusalem, the famous anti-Arian bishop (348–386), was a popular figure in Coptic homiletic literature, as testified by eight homilies that are explicitly attributed to him.<sup>2</sup> Seven of them have been preserved completely, some even in more than one copy. They once belonged to the Library of Saint Michael's Monastery at Hamuli and are now kept at the Pierpont Morgan Library (New York). Fragments of some of them have also been preserved in

---

<sup>1</sup> The study of Coptic homiletic literature has been enormously facilitated by the *Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari* (CMCL), created and directed by Tito Orlandi, Rome, which *inter alia* contains the *Clavis Patrum Coptorum* (CPC). The CPC aims to number all known Coptic literary texts and provides much relevant information on the preserved texts and manuscripts (to be found at <http://www.cmcl.let.uniroma1.it>).

<sup>2</sup> Scholars have also attributed three anonymous Coptic homilies to Cyril of Jerusalem. The first is called *In 24 Seniores* (CPC 0560), published in A. Campagnano, A. Maresca, and T. Orlandi (eds), *Quattro omelie copte. Vita di Giovanni Crisostomo, Encomi dei 24 Vegliardi* (Ps. Procle e Anonimo), *Encomio di Michele Arcangelo di Eustazio di Tracia* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' Antichità, Serie Copta, 60), Milano, Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1977, 49–50, 83–104. An Arabic translation of this homily, which 'correspond dans les grandes lignes au texte copte,' is ascribed to Cyril (see E. Lucchesi, 'L'homélie copte acéphale en l'honneur des XXIV vieillards,' *AB* 117 (1999) 289–290), but this need not imply that also the Coptic tradition likewise attributed it to the bishop of Jerusalem. The second homily is called *In Canticum Vineae. In Is. 5* (CPC 0020). Orlandi, in CMCL, sub CPC 0020, suggested that it might be attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem 'per motivi puramente interni all'opera,' though he thought the attribution also 'molto dubbia.' In an equally inconclusive manner, it has been suggested that the homily might be a work of Hesychius of Jerusalem, see S. Bacot, 'Le "Chant de la vigne" en langue copte: Une nouvelle approche,' in A. Boud' hors and C. Louis (eds.), *Études Coptes XI. Treizième journée d'études (Marseille, 7–9 juin 2007)* (Cahiers de la Bibliothèque copte, 17), Paris: De Boccard, 2010, 201–211. Of the third homily that has been ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem only a few fragments have been preserved, which deal with the Virgin Mary (CPC 0005). CMCL probably attributed these fragments to Cyril because some other fragments, which are now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, C4, 1–2 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 212, Nr. 109; see also *ibidem*, 208–211, Nr. 108), once were part of the same codex that also contained Pseudo-Cyril's homily *On the Resurrection and the Passion* (Pierpont Morgan Library C4, 3–4; see below on *Homily 4*). However, the fragments C4, 1–2 did not belong to this homily.

other manuscripts that came from other monasteries and are now in several European and Egyptian libraries. One homily has only partly been recovered, in two manuscripts of which fragments are kept in Cairo, New York and in a private collection. Although some of these homilies may have been translated from the Greek, there are no indications that any of them were really authored by Cyril of Jerusalem. Unfortunately, the scholars who wrote about the Cyrillian homilies have used various and sometimes misleading names to indicate the separate texts.<sup>3</sup> Campagnano and Depuydt distinguish four homilies on the Passion, which the former numbers as ‘*Sulla Passione* I, II, a and β,’ whereas the latter speaks about them as, respectively, ‘*On the Passion*, II, I, III, and IV.’ That the fourth homily, ‘β’ or ‘IV,’ is called ‘*On the Passion*’ is rather incomprehensible, because it exclusively deals with the resurrection of Christ and for that reason should be entitled *On the Resurrection*.<sup>4</sup> A similar situation occurs with the homily which is called ‘*Sulla Passione* II’ by Campagnano and ‘*On the Passion* I’ or ‘*On New (Low) Sunday*’ by Depuydt. Only the last title is correct, for the homily does not say a word about the Passion and only deals with the events of the first Sunday after Easter, which the Greeks and the Copts called ‘*New Sunday*.’ Moreover, our text, M610, is not included in these four homilies on the Passion, although it almost entirely focused on the arrest of Jesus and the events preceding his crucifixion. The observation that there are interconnections between some of these texts, has led to the idea of a ‘Cyrillian cycle’ of Coptic homilies, to which, however, not all the homilies ascribed to Cyril are thought to belong. This unsatisfactory state of affairs makes a fresh look at the eight Cyrillian homilies and their possible interconnections indispensable. In order to avoid further confusion, I suggest to number the homilies that are attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, starting with those that deal with the Passion and the Resurrection of Christ, and to give them a title that is based on the analysis of their contents given below. Thus the following homilies can be distinguished:

1. *On the Life and Passion of Christ* (CPC 0113)
2. *On the Passion and the Resurrection* (CPC 0116)

---

<sup>3</sup> On these texts: T. Orlandi, ‘Cyrillo di Gerusalemme,’ 93–100; idem, ‘Patristica copta e patristica greca,’ *Vetera Christianorum* 10 (1973) 327–341 (esp. 334); idem, ‘Coptic Literature,’ in B.A. Pearson & J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, 51–81 (esp. 78–80); Campagnano, *Omelie copte*, 10–14; on the twelve complete manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library, see Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 134–135.

<sup>4</sup> Hyvernât, *Checklist*, 16, already gave it the correct title: *Discourse on the Resurrection of Christ*; also Orlandi, ‘Cirillo de Gerusalemme,’ 98: *In Resurrectionem Domini*.

3. *On the Resurrection* (CPC 0117)
4. *On the Resurrection and the Passion* (CPC 0114)
5. *On New Sunday* (CPC 0115)
6. *On the Virgin Mary* (CPC 0119)
7. *On the Holy Cross* (CPC 0120)
8. *On Mary Magdalene* (CPC 0118)

It is important to bear in mind that a clear distinction must be made between the actual contents of a text and the information about the contents as given in the heading, the superscription, above the text.<sup>5</sup>

1. *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* (CPC 0113)

*Manuscript:* Pierpont Morgan M610, folio's 2<sup>ro</sup>–26<sup>vo</sup> (pp. Ⲭ–Ⲛ [1–50]), Facs. ed., vol. 44, 5–54 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 129–131, No. 64).

*Modern titles:* *Exegesis delivered on Easter Wednesday* (Hyvernath, *Checklist*, 16), *In Passionem Domini* (Orlandi, 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme,' 100), *In passionem Domini* (Campagnano, *Omélies*, 10), *Homily delivered on Wednesday after Easter* (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 129), *De Vita et Passione Christi* (CPC 0113).

*Edition and translation:* this volume, 121–179.

*Superscription:* 'A homily which the holy Apa Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, delivered in the early morning of the fourth day of the Great Pascha. He delivered it at the door of the sanctuary, as the people beseeched him: "Give us to drink from the well of your blessing." He, then, started with the writings of the apostles and related a good deal of their contents. And they marvelled at his teaching, which was sweeter than honey. He started with the sufferings which our Saviour endured for us, which are as follows. In the peace of God. Amen.'

*Contents:*

§§ 1–4: *Introduction.* Parmoute is the month of new life, but also of the Fall in Paradise and of Judas' betrayal of Jesus, who was killed 'when the day of the moon coincided with the day of the month' (§ 4).

§§ 5–11: *The writings of the apostles.* Apostolic writings were found in the house of Mary, the mother of Mark. A small volume in short hand,

---

<sup>5</sup> The information on the manuscripts of the homilies discussed below is largely based on the data assembled in CPC, with additions of my own.

containing a narrative about Jesus and his Passion, was read to Cyril by the priest Bachius. It began with an enumeration of the worldly professions of the apostles.

§§ 12–20: *The apostles speak about their calling.*

§§ 21–33: *Why the Jews wanted to kill Jesus.* Because of his miracles, Jesus attracted a great number of followers, who ceased from going to the synagogue and the temple and from paying the tithes. For that reason, the chief priest and the teachers of the law went to the rulers of the people and asked for action to be taken against Jesus.

§§ 34–41: *Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea defend Jesus.* Joseph tells the chief priests and the teachers of the law how the Virgin Mary first lived in the temple, was entrusted to Joseph the Carpenter when she was twelve years old, and then became the mother of Christ. Nicodemus assures the Jewish leaders that this story is true and quotes Micah 5:1 as a scriptural testimony.

§§ 42–45: *Nicodemus baptized by Jesus.*

§§ 46–52: *Lazarus raised from the dead.*

§§ 53–58: *Jesus announces his death.* Peter: ‘This shall not happen to you.’ Jesus: ‘You are a stumbling-block to me.’ Mary asks Jesus to flee to Egypt again, but Jesus fortells her that he will appear to her three days after his death.

§§ 59–61: *The cleansing of the temple.* The priests and the scribes try to stone Jesus in vain.

§§ 62–76: *Judas and the Jewish leaders.* On the advice of his wife, Judas negotiates with the Jewish leaders about the betrayal of Jesus, who is preparing for the celebration of the Passover at Jerusalem. This happened on the first day of the month of Parmoute; the Jews gave Judas an advance on the bribe money (§§ 62–71). On the tenth day (Monday), Judas promises to deliver Jesus the next day. He will indicate Jesus by the sign of a kiss, for the Jews cannot recognize Jesus because of his ever changing appearance. Judas receives the rest of the thirty silver pieces and brings it to his wife (§§ 72–76).

§§ 77–80: *Jesus shows his divine nature.* He assures his disciples that he can escape from his imminent suffering, if he wants to do so (told by the disciples themselves).

§§ 81–103: *The Last Supper and the arrest of Jesus.* On Tuesday, the eleventh of the month, ‘when the day of the moon coincided with the day of the month’ (§ 82), Jesus celebrated the Passover with his disciples across the brook Kedron, where there was a garden. Thereupon, they go to ‘the mountain,’ where Jesus is tempted, but Mary is left behind, hidden in the

garden. Judas arrives with his men, armed with swords and torches, and kisses Jesus (§§ 81–90). Jesus curses Judas and his wife in a long speech and predicts their horrible deaths (§§ 91–98). Peter tries to kill the servant of the High Priest, but only cuts his ear off. He is compared to Moses, who only struck the Egyptian with a papyrus scroll (§§ 99–103).

§§ 104–113: *Jesus before the High Priest*. By tearing his clothes, the High Priest made himself unworthy of the priesthood, for which the author refers to Leviticus 19:6 and 21:10 and to an alleged Jewish practice of dishonouring a priest (§ 106). ‘Cyril’ says that he has been preaching for a long time from the *Constitutions of the Apostles* about what is being commemorated today, the fourth day of the week, on which Jesus was arrested and suffered. Jesus was struck with scourges and fists ‘until he became dizzy and fell on his hip’ (§ 108–109). Under pressure of Nicodemus, the Jewish priests decide to take Jesus to the governor, Pontius Pilate.

§§ 114–129: *Jesus before Pilate and Herod*. Description of Jesus’ physical appearance (§ 114). When Pilate learns that Jesus is a Galilean, he writes a letter (§ 119) to Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee, and sends Jesus to Herod. But Jesus does not respond to Herod’s questions and he is sent back to Pilate with a letter from the tetrarch advising Pilate to have Jesus crucified as soon as possible (§§ 122–124). In the morning of the fifth day, Thursday, Jesus is again brought before Pilate. Pilate wants to release Jesus and offers Barabbas in his place, but the Jewish leaders postpone the decision to the next day and persuade the crowd to ask for the release of Barabbas (§§ 127–129).

§§ 130–136: *Jesus and Pilate in the dining-room*. Pilate and Jesus eat a meal together. Pilate advises Jesus to flee and offers to have his own son killed in Jesus’ place, but Jesus replies that he wants to be crucified, as the prophecies about his crucifixion have to be fulfilled. They then eat, served by a boy of about ten years old; ‘after that they went to sleep’ (§ 135). In what seems a later addition, Pilate once again offers to have his own son crucified in Jesus’ place. Jesus then reveals to him his divine nature by disappearing from Pilate’s sight for a long time; Pilate faints and is raised by Jesus. He then understands that Jesus could save himself if he wished to do so (§§ 136–137).

§§ 138–153: *The dreams of Pilate and Procla*. In his sleep Pilate had a dream-vision: the world was dark, nobody was able to see, and then an eagle came down from heaven with a ‘cistern of light’ and a wreath on its head. It announced that the light had been given to Egypt. The Jews remained blind and crucified the eagle, the Egyptians saw it and were amazed. Then the eagle came to life again and flew back to heaven (§§ 138–140). Pilate’s

wife, Procla, also had a dream: an eagle stood at her couch and told her that her life-time would be almost equal to that of the eagle itself; after which the eagle was beheaded (§§ 141–143). According to Jesus' interpretation, he himself is the eagle that Pilate saw; the darkness on earth is idol worship and sin, the cistern of light is baptism, the wreath on the eagle's head is the crown of thorns, and the tree is the wood of the cross, etc. The covenant with the Jews will be abrogated and pass to the Egyptians, who will build churches for the worship of Christ (§§ 144–151). The eagle that his wife saw is Pilate himself: he will be decapitated and his wife will die on the same day (§§ 152–153).

§§ 154–160: *Conclusion*. The author observes that until this point he has been speaking about what is written in the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, but now it is time to stop (§ 154: 'behold the light has risen'). Later on, he promises, he will give more information on the crucifixion, on Jesus' burial by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, the resurrection and Jesus' appearance to his mother Mary (§§ 154–155). Today he has spoken about the events that happened on 'the twelfth day of the moon of the month of April, which is Parmoute' (§ 157), which are then briefly summarized. Wishing that God, 'who has suffered for us,' may keep the congregation pure from every pollution, the authors ends his homily with an eulogy on the Trinity.

The superscription offers a succinct but not incorrect summary of the homily. That it was delivered in the early morning of the fourth day of Holy Week ('the Great Pascha')<sup>6</sup> is also stated in the text itself (§§ 154, 157). The same applies to the reference to the writings of the apostles. The long stories about the encounter of Jesus and Pilate and the dreams of Pilate and Procla are not mentioned in the superscription. According to the author, these stories were part of the 'writings of the apostles,' which are identified as the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, though in fact they most probably came from an unknown comprehensive work of the Pilate cycle.<sup>7</sup>

The homily focusses on the events of Tuesday evening and Wednesday of Holy Week. As demonstrated in the preceding chapter, several originally separate traditions have been merged in the general framework of the 'writings of the apostles.' The most notable of these traditions are the list of the worldly professions of the disciples, the chronology of Holy Week, the description of Jesus' external appearance, and traditions about Pilate.

---

<sup>6</sup> See pp. 2–3.

<sup>7</sup> See p. 34.

The homily relates an event in which Cyril himself was involved (the discovery of the writings of the apostles),—a feature which is also characteristic of the homilies *On the Virgin Mary* and *On the Holy Cross*. It is of interest to note that the priest Bachius, Cyril's short hand expert in *On the Life and Passion of Christ*, also plays an important role in the homily *On the Holy Cross*. But whereas in the former he is a dignitary in Cyril's episcopal palace, a bishop ordained by Cyril himself, he is still described as the archimandrite of a small monastery in the vicinity of Ascalon in the latter. This shows that the homily *On the life and the Passion of Christ* presupposes the homily *On the Holy Cross*.

## 2. On the Passion and the Resurrection (*CPC 0116*)

*Manuscript:* Pierpont Morgan Library M595, fol. 68<sup>ro</sup>–79<sup>vo</sup> (pp. 𐩱𐩺–𐩱𐩮 [137–159]); Facs. ed., vol. 43, 137–159 (Depuydt, Catalogue, 347, No. 170, 4).

*Modern titles:* *Discourse on the Feast of Feasts (Easter)* (Hyvernât, *Checklist*, 16), *In Passionem Domini* (Orlandi, 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme,' 98), *Sulla passione a* (Campagnano), *Homily III on the Passion* (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 347), *De Passione A* (CC 0116).

*Edition and Italian translation:* Campagnano, *Omèlie copte*, 23–53.

*Superscription:* 'A homily of our holy father Apa Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, which he delivered at the Feast of Feasts, namely the Sunday of the breaking of the fast of the Holy Passion of our Saviour, when he baptized Castor the Jew, while the whole city was assembled at the church which is called "The Resurrection." He adduced a great number of persuasive testimonies from the holy Scriptures, putting the unbelief of the Jews to shame. But in this same homily, he also explained many stories by Josephus and Irenaeus, the Jewish teachers. He delivered this homily while the Christ-loving empress Helena, the mother of the God-loving emperor Constantine, was seated at his side, so that the entire crowd of Jerusalem marvelled at him as they heard the force of his teaching and his holy instructions, which are full of life.'

### *Contents:*

§§ 1–4: *Introduction.* Moses' exhortation in Exodus 15:21: 'Let us sing to the Lord, for he has been glorified in glory,' was in fact not directed to the incredulous Jews but was meant for the Christians.

§§ 5–8: *Some information about the background of the Virgin Mary.* The author emphasizes (§ 6) that Mary was a normal human being: 'We do



not say with Antonius the Shoemaker and Severus, who is unworthy to be named, that the Theotokos was a spirit, but we believe that she was begotten as we are, from the sexual union of a man and a woman, and that she was generated like everyone.'

§§ 9–30: *The passion and death of Christ*. He was crucified at Golgotha, the place where Adam had been buried; the blood and water that came out of Christ's side baptized Adam and opened to him the way back to Paradise (§§ 17–18). In connection with Christ's exclamation; 'I thirst' (John 19:28), the author polemizes against people who say that Christ did not feel the sufferings he underwent at the cross. The testimony of Irenaeus, 'the historian' is invoked to prove that the suffering was real (§ 19–20). The 'polluted' Carpocratians should shut his mouth, because he says that Christ could not know that the soldiers were offering him vinegar, unless he had tasted it (§ 22). The Jews are attacked because they reject the salvific suffering of Christ. Salvation is for the non-Jews: Rahab the prostitute, Ruth, and of course the gentile Christians (§§ 23–25). The death of Christ is related very briefly, with reference to John 19:30; the Jews are attacked again. Christ died at the ninth hour, the lance pierced his side at the tenth hour, Joseph of Arimathea took him from the cross at the eleventh hour and buried him at sunset, i.e. the twelfth hour (§§ 26–30).

§§ 31–38: *The resurrection*. The text presents the events as they are found in John 20:1–18: On Sunday, early in the morning, the women go to the tomb and discover that the stone has been moved away and that Jesus' body is not there. Thereupon, Peter and John also go to the tomb, and Mary, 'the mother of the Saviour,' encounters and recognizes her risen Son, though she first took him for the gardener (πικεπορος ἡτεωμνη) (§ 36).

§§ 39–41: *Conclusion*. The preacher says that for today enough has been said: 'We shall complete the rest in the next service (συνάξις),' and he concludes his sermon with some ethical exhortations (§ 39) and a blessing (§ 41). But within this rather common conclusion, the author, or more probably a later reviser, has inserted a short passage on Castor the Jew, who is directly addressed (§ 40): 'And you, Castor the Jew, recognize the grace which has occurred to you, as it has occurred to myself. Do not only wear sheep's clothing and keep the wickedness within you as a rapacious wolf. Renounce the deadly love for the letter and follow the vivifying Spirit. Cry out with the prophet: "I have fallen but I shall rise again," because the desire of Christ is in charity, and he has made man by his mercy.'

According to the superscription, the sermon was delivered on Easter Sunday. The term 'Feast of feasts' (ἐορτὴ τῶν ἐορτῶν) could be used of most of the great Christian feasts (Christmas, Easter, Pentecost),<sup>8</sup> but that Easter is here meant appears from the addition that it was the Sunday of 'the breaking of the fast of the Holy Pascha of our Saviour' (πρωλ ἡγίαςχα ἡπενσωτήρ), which means 'the fast of Holy week'.<sup>9</sup> However, the text itself does not contain any indication that the homily was pronounced on Easter Sunday. Its contents, with a passage on the Virgin Mary, a long section on the Passion and only a short rendering of the Resurrection story according to John, would indeed make it a very unusual Easter homily. The baptism of Castor the Jew is alluded to, but not explicitly discussed, in § 40, which seems to be a later insertion, probably based on the superscription itself. Castor is also mentioned in the enumeration of Cyril's homilies in *On the Holy Cross*.<sup>10</sup> The sermon does not contain 'many stories by Irenaeus and Josephus, the Jewish teachers' (!). In the sermon, there is only one alleged quotation of Irenaeus (§ 20), while Josephus is not mentioned at all. The text does not make any reference to the 'empress' Helena, nor to the Anastasis Church of Jerusalem. It will be clear that the heading of the text in the manuscript has nothing or little to do with the contents of the text itself. The text is in fact not an Easter homily, but an edifying discourse on Christ, his mother and his passion, death and resurrection. The superscription is primarily meant to give some couleur locale to the attribution of the text to Cyril of Jerusalem. Since the section on the Passion takes up the greater part of the text, the usual title 'On the Passion' would appear to be acceptable. However, it seems more appropriate to entitle the work as *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, because the author obviously intended to discuss not only Jesus' passion and death, but also his resurrection.

### 3. On the Resurrection (CPC 017)

*Manuscript:* Pierpont Morgan Library M595, fol. 93<sup>vo</sup>–100<sup>ro</sup> (pp. ϣϣ–σα [188–201]); Facs. ed., vol. 43, 188–201 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 347–348, No. 170, 6).

*Modern titles:* *Discourse on the Resurrection of Christ* (Hyvernât, *Checklist*, 16), *In Resurrectionem Domini* (Orlandi, 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme,' 98–99), *Sulla Passione β* (Campagnano), *Homily IV on the Passion* (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 347), *De Passione B.* (CPC).

<sup>8</sup> Lampe, *Lexicon*, 505a, s.v. ἐορτὴ, A.2.

<sup>9</sup> Lampe, *Lexicon*, 911b, s.v. νηστεία, C.2.b.

<sup>10</sup> See p. 115.

*Edition and Italian translation:* Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 55–73.

*Superscription:* ‘Another homily which the holy Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, has delivered about the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the peace of God. Amen.’

*Contents:*

§§ 1–2: *Introduction.* ‘Today it is the Feast of the Resurrection’ (§ 1). ‘We have seen that he went up to heaven and said to his mother Mary: “Hasten and bring the news to my brethren—that is to say, to us—: Rejoice, for my Son has risen from the dead; I have seen him face to face”’ (§ 2).

§§ 3–5: *At the empty tomb.* The women inform the disciples (§ 3); the ‘new Miriam’ (i.e. the Virgin Mary) strikes her tambourine saying: ‘He has been glorified in glory’ (Exodus 15:20–21), and reports that she has met her risen Son. Thereupon Peter goes to the tomb and sees the linen wrappings and the face cloth, as told in John 20:6–7.

§§ 6–9: *Retelling of Luke 23:13–53.*

§§ 10–14: *Christ himself recounts what happened at his resurrection.*

§§ 15–18: *Thomas* (John 20:24–29), *rehabilitation of Peter* (John 20:15–17).

§§ 19–23: *Conclusion and exhortation.* Other biblical testimonies of the resurrection and the divinity of Christ are quoted, int. al. 1 Corinthians 15:5–8, 20, and John 1:1. The congregation is exhorted to be joyful, ‘now we are freed from our holy fast,’ and to celebrate a spiritual festival, ‘for he has taken the glory from the hands of the Jews and given it to us, the Christians.’ Christ invites them to eat his body and to drink his blood; they must greet one another with a holy kiss and and go up to the altar for the communion.

The superscription correctly describes the contents of the homily: it deals exclusively with the Resurrection. It is called ‘another homily,’ because it is preceded in the manuscript by the homily *On New Sunday* (no. 5). There is a distinct connection with the homily *On the Passion and the Resurrection* (no. 2) which ended with the scene of Mary and Christ in the garden and the preacher’s promise to speak about the rest of the Resurrection story in the next service. In this sermon, the preacher refers to this scene with the words ‘we have seen’ and continues the biblical story with Mary’s account of her meeting with the risen Christ to the disciples. Moreover, Mary is compared with the biblical Miriam and she, too, sings: ‘He has been glorified in glory,’—the same song that is quoted at the beginning of the homily *On the Passion and the Resurrection*. The homily *On the Resurrection* was clearly meant as a sequel to that *On the Passion and the Resurrection*. Although

the former has much more the form of a real Easter homily, both texts are characterized by a simple retelling of the biblical story, in particular that of the Gospel according to John. There are no digressions relating to personal experiences of Cyril himself or the insertion of apocryphal material that are found in some other homilies attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem.

#### 4. On the Resurrection and the Passion (CPC 0114)

##### *Manuscripts:*

- a) Pierpont Morgan Library M595, folio's. 1<sup>vo</sup>–27<sup>vo</sup> (pp. ̄̄̄̄̄̄ [1–54]); Facs. ed., vol. 43, 3–56 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 345–346, No. 170, 1);
- b) Pierpont Morgan Library M594, fol. 1<sup>vo</sup>–19<sup>vo</sup> + Plimpton. fol. 2<sup>vo</sup>–7<sup>vo</sup> (pp. ̄̄̄̄̄̄ [1–48]), Facs. ed., vol. 42, 5–56 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 133–134, No. 66);
- c) papyrus fragments in New York (Pierpont Morgan Library, C4, 3–4; Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 212, No. 109, who failed to recognize the connection with M594 and M595).<sup>11</sup>
- d) fragments from various parchment codices, many of them from the White Monastery, the greater part of which has been included in Tito Orlandi's CMCL, sub CPC 0114 (enumerates 14 manuscripts), and in Buzi's *Catalogo*.<sup>12</sup> Much work remains to be done in this area: the fragments have been dispersed over many libraries, their assignment to specific codices is far from being completed and often remains uncertain, and it may be assumed that there are still other fragments which have not yet been recognized as belonging to this homily. So Alin Suciu managed to reconstruct a considerable part of CPC 0114 from sixteen folios of a separate manuscript (not recorded as such in CMCL), which are kept in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale and Louvre),<sup>13</sup> Naples, Cairo,

<sup>11</sup> See E. Lucchesi, 'D'une Vie de Marie à une Homélie sur la Passion,' *AB* 114 (1996) 269–272, who was the first to show that the papyrus contained a fragment of Pseudo-Cyril's *On the Resurrection and the Passion*.

<sup>12</sup> Paola Buzi, *Catalogo dei manoscritti copti Borgiani conservati presso la Biblioteca Nazionale "Vittorio Emanuele III" di Napoli, con un profilo scientifico di Stefano Borgia e Georg Zoega e una breve storia della formazione della collezione Borgiana* (Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Licei, Anno CDVI—2009, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Memorie, Serie IX, vol. 25, fasc. 1, Roma: Scienze e Lettere, 2009), 286–287 (IB 14.27 and 14.28), 292–293 (IB 14.38).

<sup>13</sup> A good catalogue of the Coptic manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale is still urgently needed; for the Louvre, see Anne Boud'hors, 'Le catalogage des textes coptes du Louvre,' in Emmel et al. (eds.), *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit*, II, 261.

Vienna and London.<sup>14</sup> Since the data provided by CMCL, Buzi and Suciū are easily accessible and also because so much is still uncertain, I shall here refrain from enumerating the manuscript fragments that have been identified as containing parts of the *Homily on the Resurrection and the Passion*. As testified by the many manuscripts, the homily must have been very popular.

*Modern titles: Discourse on the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ* (Hyvernāt, *Checklist*, 15), *In Passionem Domini* (Orlandi, 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme,' 98), *Sulla Passione I* (Campagnano), *Homily II On the Passion* (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 133, 345), *De Passione I*. (CPC), *De Passione I* (Buzi, 286, 293).

*Edition and translation:* unedited and not translated.

*Superscription:* 'A homily of the holy Apa Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, which he delivered about the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and about the great miracle that happened on the day he was crucified, how the cities and the villages around Jerusalem came down and saw what happened on the day he was crucified, and about how he gave his virginal mother to John the Virgin, and about how the veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom, and about all the curses which he uttered about Judas from those prophecies of David, and (how), as he rose from the dead, he first appeared to her who had conceived him and to Peter and John. In the peace of God. Amen.'

*Contents:*

pp. 1–10: *the glory of the resurrection*. It is a great feast today, that of the resurrection of Christ. Whether we have fasted or even almost died as a result of our asceticism, the joy of this yearly feast gives new force to our body (p. 1). Christ came to the world in humility, he performed many miracles, raised several people from the dead (the son of the widow at Nain, the son of the officer at Capernaum, Lazarus), but the glory of his resurrection is much greater. Today the entire world has been saved, we participate in the resurrection of the Lord; our death does not exist anymore: if we die, we shall rise again in the second resurrection. The author expresses himself in a highly rhetorical manner. The salvific effects of Christ's resurrection are described in a series of sentences all beginning

---

<sup>14</sup> A. Suciū, 'The Borgian Coptic Manuscripts in Naples: Supplementary Identifications and Notes to a Recently Published Catalogue,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 77 (2011) 299–325.

with: 'Today ...' (pp. 2–4). Today, the underworld has been destroyed and the 'men of old' have returned to their place of rest again, but today also Psalm 98 has been fulfilled: nature is full of joy and new life (*int. al.*, 'Today the birds have spread their wings and received new force, celebrating the resurrection of the Lord'). The author states that on the one hand he wants to speak because of the glory of this feast, but on the other hand also wants to be silent, because he is hampered by his poor rhetorical skills and his limited mind. He exclaims: 'Who is able to honour this blood that was shed on our behalf?', and then bursts into a long rhetorical passage about the meaning of the blood of Christ, consisting of fourteen sentences all beginning with 'A blood that ...' or 'Not a blood like that of ...' (pp. 4–6). Then the author adduces a number of biblical texts which speak about 'opening / entering the gates.' Isaiah 26:2–4, is quoted, but also Psalm 23 (LXX):7–10 and Psalm 117 (LXX):19 and 20. These gates, the author explains, are the gates of heaven which have opened today to let Christ in, and not only Christ but also the saints of the Old Testament. A great number of them is summoned to come forward and to rejoice in the resurrection of the Lord: Adam, Abel, Methusala, Henoch, Jared, Arphaxad and their sons, Noah and his sons, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Ruben, Simeon, Levi, Joseph, Jesaja, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the dead that rose from their graves and showed themselves openly in Jerusalem. At that point, the author seems to have realised that a number of important people were missing from his list, adding Moses, Aaron, Elia and Samuel (pp. 6–10). Of all these biblical persons it is explicitly stated why they are invited to enter the gates of heaven on this day of the resurrection of Christ. To mention only one example: 'Aaron, come and see the one who has borne the staff of the priesthood, of yourself and your sons. You were the first to offer the sacrifice as an image of his body and blood, behold, now he has completed his sacrifice by his own blood and he has risen from the dead.' The first part of the sermon concludes with some remarks about the miraculous nature of the resurrection, *int. al.*: 'A body that itself rose from the dead, from a tomb; nobody knew its resurrection; a resurrection which became manifest without illusion; a stone that was rolled away without a human hand.'

pp. 11–52: the story of Christ's Passion and Resurrection, mainly according to John. Rather unexpectedly, the author announces that he now wishes to speak a little about the things that are related to today's feast of the resurrection. John the Evangelist is summoned to come forward, and the author says: 'I shall begin with your own words,' after which he quotes John 13, 1, followed by a circumstantial account of the rest

of that chapter (pp. 11–18). Judas' treacherous behaviour receives much attention: the author addresses him directly, quoting Psalm 108 (LXX):7–8 (p. 12) and 9–17, which, according to him, refer to Judas and his fate (pp. 15–16). The pact between Judas and the Jewish leaders, Jesus' struggle in Gethsemane, and some elements related to the arrest of Jesus, which are not mentioned in the Gospel according to John, are briefly mentioned (p. 18; cf. Matthew 26:14–16, 36–46, 47–50). The pre-arranged sign of the kiss (Matthew 26:48–49; Mark 14:44–45; Luke 22:48) was necessary, as the people who came to arrest Jesus did not know him, because he constantly changed his physical appearance.<sup>15</sup> The disciples were first arrested, though immediately released at the request of Jesus, which is obviously an uncanonical addition, based on the words of Jesus in John 18:8: 'Let these others go' (p. 20). After the arrest of Jesus, Peter drew his sword and cut off the right ear of the High-Priest's servant Malchus (John 18:10). The author addresses Peter directly and says that this act was a sign of his love for the Lord (p. 22). Next the denial of Peter is told in a free rendering of the story as it occurs in the four Gospels (Matthew 26:69–75; Mark 14:66–72; Luke 22:54–62; and John 18:17 and 25–27). Peter is again directly addressed by the author, who assures him that Christ knows that in his heart Peter has not denied his Lord so that he forgives him. For that reason, he should be forgiving to other sinners, too. The episode of Jesus' appearance before Annas and Caiaphas (John 18:12–24) is omitted. The story continues with the trial before Pilate, again in a free combination of synoptic and Johannine elements (pp. 24–32). After Pilate's famous question: 'What is truth?', the author addresses him directly, saying *int. al.*: 'Don't you see that truth and grace and life are coming from the mouth of him who is speaking with you? (...) Take courage, Pilate, because you, too, are not far from him (...). Take water, Pilate, and wash your hands, that he may wash away your sins and your transgressions. Be innocent of his blood, Pilate, that you may be worthy of his holy resurrection. Don't be afraid, Pilate, for you believe in him' (p. 28). After the death-sentence and the mocking of Jesus, the author summons David to stand in the midst of the congregation and 'to sing according to the saying that is fitting to this feast of today,' followed by a long quotation of Psalm 83:6–19 (p. 31). From the moment Christ is crucified, the author pays much attention to the reactions and the behaviour of his mother Mary. It was very exceptional that she openly stood near the cross, it was only because of the death of

---

<sup>15</sup> See p. 54 above.

her son that she appeared in public: 'For it was not her habit at all to look at strange men, she went out to the market-place in the middle of the day' (p. 34). As she bewails the fate of her son, she says: '... I can't speak, because I am afraid that the godless Jews will recognize me.' That the Jews did not know Mary also explains why, according to the author, Jesus only gave a sign (ⲁⲩⲁⲭⲟⲣⲙ) to John and Mary and did not speak to them directly (which seems to mean that he did not explicitly mention their names). After retelling the scene of John 19:26–27, he says: 'Why did he give a sign to her and did he not speak? The reason was that bystanders should not know her' (p. 37). Mary then went to John's house and did not witness her son's death, but was told later on that Jesus had died, had been taken from the cross and had been buried in a new tomb. The author adds a long eulogy in praise of the Virgin (pp. 38–39). The story continues with a brief reference to the death of Jesus (darkness, the veil of the temple torn in two, saints raised from their graves) and a more circumstantial account of the breaking of the legs and the piercing of Jesus' side with the lance (John 19:31–34; pp. 40–41). All that time, Judas was in distress and did not know what to do, because he realized that he had shed innocent blood. According to the author, Judas hanged himself because he was counselled by the devil, 'his friend in evil' (ⲡⲉⲩⲱⲃⲱⲛⲣ ⲉⲛ ⲧⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ), who said to him: 'As he (Jesus) dies, he will descend to the underworld and bring the captivity (ⲟⲩⲕⲙⲁⲗⲱⲥⲓⲁ = ⲁⲓⲭⲙⲁⲗⲱⲥⲓⲁ) up. If you listen to me and hang yourself and are in the underworld before him, he will have pity on you and bring you up with him' (p. 43). Pilate was glad to be asked for the body of Jesus by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, 'because he believed in Jesus too' (p. 43). In the mean time, Mary was so disconsolate that the women who accompanied her decided to take her to the tomb of Jesus, so that she could see her dead son. As they arrived at the grave, they saw the stone rolled away and encountered angels who asked them whom they were looking for, but Mary was so distressed that she did not take notice of the angels. The women, believing that Jesus has risen from the dead, return home, but Mary remains behind and says: 'My son, my only begotten, I shall not leave this place until I have found your body, even if I have to stay here for many days' (pp. 44–48). Next the story of John 20:11–18 is told. Mary takes the risen Jesus for the gardener (ⲡⲕⲱⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲱⲛⲏ)<sup>16</sup> and utters a long lamentation about her son, even promising the 'gardener' to pay him money and to keep the deal secret, if he will

<sup>16</sup> See p. 24.



indicate the place where Jesus' body had been hidden (pp. 48–49). As the risen Christ addresses her ('Mary!') and she recognizes him and wants to touch him, he continues with a long speech, telling her amongst other things: 'My mother, don't touch my garment, for my Father has clothed me with it as he raised me' (pp. 50–51). Mary is ordered to announce the resurrection of Christ to the disciples ('my brothers, i.e. the apostles') and bid them to go to Galilee (cf. Matthew 28:7 and Mark 16:7 [where this is said to the women, not to Mary]). The author ends his story of the resurrection with the episode of the bribing of the guards (Matthew 28:11–15), a vain attempt to hide the truth.

pp. 52–54: *final exhortations and conclusion*. The author returns to the present feast of the resurrection of Christ: 'Therefore, come, all races of the earth, and praise with me today the one who has risen from the dead. He has opened for us the door of all good things. Today it is the feast of the resurrection, my beloved!' The congregation is exhorted not to defile their bodies and souls with evil deeds and thoughts and not to destroy the fruit of the past period of fasts by indulging in all kinds of sins: 'For I know that you have suffered much through the strong fasts of these six days and these vowed wakeful nights. Do not destroy the suffering of these forty days in a single hour, let this day of eating and drinking and abundance not destroy this sea of good things. Do not say: "Today it is the breaking of the fast," and have yourself loosened by sin' (p. 53). The author expresses his wish that the risen Christ will find them all wearing the wedding-dress, so that they will not be cast out, and he concludes his sermon with the usual eulogy on the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

The superscription offers only a superficial and partly incorrect summary of the homily's contents. It is unclear what is meant by 'the great miracle' taking place on the day of the crucifixion. That the cities and the villages around Jerusalem came to the city and saw what happened is not found in the homily itself. It may have been derived from the following exclamation by the author: 'How many people from Jerusalem and its surroundings came to the spiritual sacrifice, how many free women came only to see him, how many sick people came to obtain healing, ...' etc. (p. 33). The veil of the temple is only briefly mentioned in a summary of the miracles that happened at the time of Jesus' death (p. 40: 'The veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom'). The curse against Judas, based on Psalm 108 (LXX), is not uttered by Jesus but by the author himself, and the appearance of Christ to Peter and John is not mentioned at all. Once again

one gets the impression that the superscription was added at a date later than the composition of the homily itself, and was based on a superficial and incomplete reading of the text.

The text itself is a remarkable piece of work. The first ten pages contain the beginning of what is undoubtedly a sermon on the Resurrection, delivered on Easter Sunday. This, however, is followed by a long, very detailed and circumstantial retelling of the passion of Christ (pp. 11–44), which then passes into the story of the resurrection (pp. 45–52). The final pages again clearly contain the conclusion of an Easter homily. It is hard to imagine that the long story of the Passion was part of the homily from the beginning. It was standard practice to give due attention to the events of the Passion in the services of Holy Week, there was no need to repeat them at large on Easter Sunday. It is conceivable that we are here dealing with an original Easter homily, in which the story of the events of Easter was expanded into a complete narrative of the passion, death and resurrection of Christ for the purpose of catechetical instruction, possibly in a monastic setting,

Since the homily does not contain any reference to Cyril of Jerusalem, it remains unclear what may have caused the attribution to this famous bishop. Probably it was simply due to Cyril's reputation as a celebrated ecclesiastical writer. It is, however, also conceivable that an original Easter homily of Cyril in Greek was adapted and expanded into the long Coptic text we now have. The story about the passion was certainly a Coptic composition: the idea that Pilate believed in Christ (pp. 28 and 43) was typically Egyptian and unthinkable in a non-Egyptian milieu.

## 5. On New Sunday (*CPC 0115*)

### *Manuscripts:*

- a) Pierpont Morgan M595, folio's 79<sup>ro</sup>–93<sup>vo</sup> (pp. ϣⲛⲟ–ϣⲛⲏ [159–188]), Facs. ed., vol. 43, 159–188 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 347, No. 170, 5);
- b) Pierpont Morgan M596, folio's 26<sup>ro</sup>–37<sup>ro</sup> (pp. ⲛⲁ–ⲟⲩ [51–73]), Facs. ed., vol. 34, 53–75 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 306–307, No. 158, 3);
- c) Pierpont Morgan M598, folio's 9<sup>ro</sup>–21<sup>vo</sup> (pp. ⲓⲯ–ⲛⲃ [17–42]), Facs. ed., vol. 35, 19–44 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 309–310, No. 159, 2);
- d) ten pages of another codex in Naples (IB 14.58–62 [pp. ⲡⲓⲯ–ϣⲕⲥ (117–126)]); Buzi, *Catalogo*, 302; not mentioned in CMCL).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> The information in Buzi's *Catalogo*, 302, provided by E. Lucchesi, is somewhat misleading: it says that the manuscript contains 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme, *De Passione I, In dominica nova* [sic!] (*CPC 0114*).' This title reflects the one given by Depuydt, not that of CMCL (see

- e) CMCL also mentions the following fragmentary manuscripts: 1. Paris (BN.131.3.51–56 [pp. 3–14]); Vienna (K.9577 pp. 17–18)]; 2. Paris (BN.131.3.51–55 [pp. unknown]), 3. Paris (BN.131.3.56 [pp. unknown]); 4. Rome (Bibliotheca Vaticana B109.114.4 [pp. unknown]); 5. Rome (Bibliotheca Vaticana RV.B109.115.2–7 [pp. unknown]); 6. Vienna (K.09577 [pp. 17–18]).

*Modern titles:* *Discourse on New (Low) Sunday* (Hyvernât, *Checklist*, 12 and 16), *In dominicam novam* (Orlandi, ‘Cirillo di Gerusalemme,’ 98), *Sulla Passione II* (Campagnano, *Omèlie copte*, 10), *Homily I on the Passion or Homily on New (Low) Sunday* (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 306, 309, 347), *De Passione 2* (CPC 0115), *De passione 1*, *In dominica nova* (Buzi; see note 17 below).

*Edition and translation:* not edited and not translated.

*Superscription:* ‘A homily which the holy Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, delivered about New Sunday, which is the eighth day after our Lord rose from the dead and appeared to his disciples, while also Thomas was with them. In peace. Amen.’

*Contents:*

pp. 159–161: *Introduction.* The author starts with the simile of the celebration of Christ’s resurrection as a copious meal. Yesterday we were unable to finish the entire meal, today we eat the remainder. In this simile, ‘yesterday’ (ἡχᾶϣ) refers to Easter Sunday, and ‘today’ to the first Sunday after Easter, which was called ‘New Sunday’ (τῆ κυριακῇ ἡμέρῃ = ἡ καὶ νῆ κυριακή or ἡ νέα κυριακή), also known as ‘Low Sunday.’<sup>18</sup> ‘Yesterday it was the feast of our salvation, because the Lord arose like someone who sleeps, but today, which is called New Sunday (τῆ κυριακῇ ἡμέρῃ), he appeared to Thomas and the apostles’ (p. 160).

pp. 161–164: *Christ’s appearance to the apostles, without Thomas.* John the Evangelist is summoned to reveal the rest of the events that happened on Easter Sunday. His story starts with John 20:19: the appearance of Jesus to the disciples, ‘when the doors were shut.’ This was a great miracle, but

---

above). I wish to thank here Paola Buzi for her kind help in sending me photographs of IB.14.58–62, which made it possible to establish beyond any possible doubt that the five folios in Naples represent another manuscript of Pseudo-Cyril’s homily 7, *On New Sunday*: they run parallel with Pierpont Morgan Library M595 fol. 90<sup>vo</sup> a.4 – fol. 93<sup>vo</sup> b.35 (= p. 181a.4 – p. 186b.35 of the manuscript).

<sup>18</sup> Lampe, *Lexicon*, 786b. Orlandi, ‘Cirillo di Gerusalemme,’ 98, already noticed that ἡχᾶϣ has to be taken here ‘in senso lato, cioè la settimana precedente.’ See also a similar passage on p. 180 of the homily.

'with God all things are possible' (Matthew 19:26). The author refers to two comparable miracles: at the Incarnation, Christ came into Mary's womb, while her door was closed and her virginity sealed; and Daniel was fed in the lions' den, which was sealed with the signet of the king (Daniel 6:18 [LXX], combined with the story of Bel and the Dragon, 31–39 [Additions to Daniel in LXX and Theodotion]). Speaking about the apostles' authorization to forgive or not to forgive any man's sins (John 20:23), the author shows himself acquainted with a tradition concerning the worldly crafts of the disciples: 'These poor and simple men enjoy this great authority. These fishers, stonemasons, sellers of greens, inviters and tanners are lords over the entire world' (p. 164).<sup>19</sup>

pp. 164–167: *The appearance on the road to Emmaus*. Before turning to the story of the unbelieving Thomas, the author draws attention to other appearances of the risen Christ. He mentions, *int. al.*, the appearance to five hundred persons at the same time (1 Corinthians 15:6), followed by a circumstantial account of the appearance to Cleopas and his brother Theopas, who were on their way to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35). At the end of this story, as the two men vow to the disciples that they had recognized Jesus at the breaking of the bread, the author returns to the story of John 20 about Christ's appearance to the apostles by saying: 'As they said this, Jesus came and stood in their midst and said to them: "Peace be with you!"' (John 20:19).

pp. 167–171: *Christ's appearance to the disciples, including Thomas*. Thomas is invited to tell his story. As the disciples say to him: 'We have seen the Lord!' (John 20:25), he expresses in a long speech his indignation that he was the only disciple who had not been allowed to see the risen Christ: 'Why have you seen him, whereas I did not? Does he love you more than me? (...) Do you love the Lord more than I do? Have I not suffered with him just like you? (...) Just as I have seen his death, so I wish to see his rising too; just as I have seen him hanging on the cross, so I wish to see the joy of his holy resurrection' (p. 168). In the scene of the appearance of Christ to Thomas, the short dialogue in John 20:26–29 is elaborated into long speeches given by Thomas and Christ. Thomas admits his unbelief, but also exonerates himself to a certain extent: 'I have been unbelieving in you with my tongue, o Lord, in order that I also should see your glory, together with all my brethren. If I had not assumed this whole attitude, my Lord, you would not have me made worthy to see you, my Lord and

<sup>19</sup> See p. 19, with quotation of the Coptic text.

my God, my God and my Lord' (p. 169). He confesses his belief in the incarnation and the resurrection of Christ, 'perfect God and truly man': 'I believe in your resurrection from the dead. I believe, my Lord, that it was the body you assumed from Mary, the Virgin and your mother, that I saw hanging on the cross and that I now see with my eyes standing before me, my Lord and my God, my God and my Lord' (pp. 170–171).

pp. 171–177: *the appearance of Christ near the Sea of Tiberias*. The author continues with the story of the fishing disciples (John 21:1–14). The apostle Peter is addressed directly with the question why he went out fishing even though he was given authority over the entire world. Peter answers that he goes out to catch real fish in order to learn to be a fisher of men. What he meant by this is explained later on, but first Peter elaborates on the difference between being a fisher of fish and a fisher of men: 'At first I cast the net into the sea and I caught fish, now, however, I cast my nets into the entire world in order to make alive the soul of men who have been destroyed by evil. (...) Yesterday it was me and my workmen, and I paid them their wages, but today it is again me and my fellow apostles, and it is Christ who rewards us. Yesterday it was a wife and children who die, but today it is Christ and his immortal Church. Yesterday it was villages and relatives, but today it is heaven and the angels' (pp. 171–172). Then the author explains why the disciples did not catch anything that night but were very successful as they followed Jesus' advice to throw the net starboard. It was to teach them that they should not become dejected if their mission to be fishers of men would not immediately be a success, because Christ would be there to help them (pp. 172–173, also 174). The author wonders why Christ addressed the disciples as 'Children' (John 21:5), because some of them were old and nobody was still youthful, let alone a child. His explanation is that they were as the little children that according to Jesus are ready to enter the kingdom of God (Matthew 18:3) and that 'their hearts were pure like that of the angels in heaven' (pp. 173–174). The apostles are commended for their obedience and wisdom, because they immediately followed Jesus' command to cast the net on the other side of the boat, although they did not recognize Jesus and thought he was a stranger (p. 175). In accordance with John 21:7, the author relates that Peter wrapped his coat (ἀπεντιγῆς = ἐπενδύτης) around him before plunging into the sea (p. 176). But apparently he found it necessary to explain this word, for he adds: 'which was his φακίριον' (= φακιάλιον = Lat. faciale), i.e. his turban or head-dress.<sup>20</sup> As the disciples

<sup>20</sup> See Liddell & Scott, *Lexicon*, 1913b, s.v. φακιάλιον; Foerster, *Wörterbuch*, 846, s.v. The word

were dragging the net to the land, they found that it contained around five hundred fishes (ⲧⲁⲱⲉ ⲛⲧⲃⲧ; John 21:11 speaks of 153). Then they saw 'a spiritual (ⲡⲛⲓⲕⲱⲛ) fire and a spiritual fish and a spiritual bread,' upon which Jesus invited them to this holy breakfast: 'Come and eat!' (John 21:12). The emphasis on the spiritual nature of this meal recurs a few lines later: 'He took the bread and also from the fish: a bread that had not been baked by the hand of a baker, a fish that had not been caught by the hand of a fisherman, a fire that had not been kindled by the hands of a man.' Christ assures the apostles that they need not to be afraid: he has prepared for them spiritual food (ⲟⲩⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲓⲕⲱⲛ) and the kingdom of heaven (pp. 176–177).

pp. 177–180: *Jesus, Peter and the Beloved Disciple*. The text continues with the story about the threefold confession of Peter (John 21:15–19). The author explains why Jesus asked Peter three times: 'Do you love me?' (p. 177). It was because the word of Moses should be fulfilled: 'In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established' (Deuteronomy 19:15; cf. Matthew 18:16 and 2 Corinthians 13:1), for Jesus has not come to destroy the law but to fulfil it (Matthew 5:17). To explain the implication of his exhortation: 'Follow me!' (John 21:19) for Peter himself, Jesus quotes Matthew 16:18–19, promising him that his earthly sufferings will be recompensed by the eternal glory that is to follow (p. 179). The saying about the Beloved Disciple and the rumour it provoked (John 21:22–23) draws the comment that death is in fact an eternal life: 'For your death too, oh apostles, is not a death but a life for ever, for the death of the Lord's saints is precious in his sight' (Psalm 116:15; pp. 179–180).

pp. 180–188: *final exhortations and conclusion*. The author returns to the feast of today, which, he says, is marked by a double joy: 'For last Sunday our Lord arose from the dead and today he appeared to his disciples and also to Thomas. Yesterday we saw that he has risen, today we see that he appears openly. Yesterday it was the Sunday of our salvation, today it is New Sunday, for last Sunday we were glorified, today our glory has become visible to everybody' (p. 180). All races of the earth are invited to glorify God and to confess with Thomas: 'My Lord and my God, my God and my Lord!' Isaiah 29:11 and 18–20 LXX are quoted and explained (pp. 180–182), e.g.: the sealed book and the man who could not read it

---

ⲁⲡⲉⲛⲧⲏⲧⲏⲥ occurs in the Coptic documentary papyri as ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲧⲏⲥ; cf. Foerster, *Wörterbuch*, 277, s.v. ?ⲉⲡⲉⲛδύτης (in a receipt: ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲓⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲟⲥ). The use of the same word in John 21:7 shows that Foerster's question mark before ⲉⲡⲉⲛδύτης can be deleted.

(vs. 11) refer to the Virgin Mary and Joseph. The unbelieving Jews, the arrogant Greeks and all other people who deny the resurrection of Christ (referred to in vs. 20) will be destroyed, although we, Christians, are also inclined to succumb to similar sins. But Christ says: 'I have not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance' (Luke 5:32). The author then points to Peter, Thomas and Paul, repentant sinners who were forgiven by Christ, but also to Judas who sinned but did not repent and whose apostleship was given to Matthias. The eternal punishment in hell is painted in dark colours, 'For it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,' according to the word of Paul (Hebrews 10:31; pp. 183–187). The homily ends with a short prayer imploring Christ not to forget his people, here in this church and all over the world, and to accept this humble eulogy by the preacher (with a reference to Mark 12:42–43; Luke 21:2–3).

The superscription offers a short but not incorrect description of the homily's contents. Its main theme is the appearance of the risen Christ to the apostles, including Thomas, on 'New Sunday' (John 20:24–29), and the events that happened on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias (John 21). That the author also related the earlier appearance to the apostles without Thomas, as an introduction to the story of the unbelieving Thomas, is understandable. The only episode without any direct connection with the events on New Sunday and the episode near the Sea of Tiberias is the story of the appearance on the way to Emmaus, taken from Luke (pp. 164–167). In view of its contents, there is no reason whatsoever to give the homily the title of 'On the Passion,' as has been done in previous research.

The homily does not contain any personal information about the author to corroborate the claim made in the superscription that the work was written by Cyril of Jerusalem. Although the dogmatic remark on pp. 170/171: 'I believe that you are perfect God (οἰνοῦτε ἐφ' ἑκ = θεὸς τέλειος) and true man (οὐρανόθεν εἰς οὐμὴν = ἀνθρώπος ἀληθινός)' has Chalcedonian undertones, it could also have been made by an anti-Arian writer from the second half of the fourth century onwards, such as Cyril of Jerusalem. However, the fact that the author was familiar with the tradition about the worldly professions of the apostles (p. 164), which was certainly still unknown in the fourth century, makes it virtually certain that the homily cannot have been written by Cyril of Jerusalem. It is quite possible, however, that the homily was originally written in Greek and later on translated into Coptic. In any case, there is no doubt that we are here concerned with a real homily, delivered for an existing community by a well-educated preacher (his exegeses deserve further investigation) with a sharp eye for the pastoral needs of his flock.

6. On the Virgin Mary (*CPC 019*)*Manuscripts:*

- a) Pierpont Morgan Library M583, fol. 139<sup>ro</sup>–157<sup>ro</sup>; Facs. ed., vol. 41, 277–313 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 328, No. 164, 7);
- b) Pierpont Morgan Library M597, fol. 46<sup>ro</sup>–74<sup>vo</sup>; Facs. ed., vol. 33, 93–150 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 205–206, No. 107, 2);
- c) British Library Or. 6784 (Layton, *Catalogue*, 127–128, No. 117);
- d) 10 folios of a parchment codex from the White Monastery, which according to CMCL are kept in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale 131.1.13 [pp. 47–48]), Cairo (Coptic Museum 9229 [pp. 51–52]), Vienna (Nationalbibliothek, Papyrussammlung K9504) [pp. 63–64], Rome (Vatican Library B109.cass. 25.120 [pp. 67–78]). 129.18.132 [pp. 79–80], and Paris (BN 129.18.132 and 129.18.134)].

*Editions and translations:* Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts*, 49–73 (text, = Brit. Libr. Or. 6784), 626–651 (transl.); Campagnano, *Omèlie copte*, 151–195 (text and Italian translation, based on M583); S. Bombeck, 'Pseudo Kyrillos In Mariam Virginem: Text und Übersetzung von Pierpont Morgan M597 fols. 46–74,' *Orientalia* 70 (2001) 40–88.

*Superscription:* 'The twenty-first homily which the holy patriarch Apa Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, has delivered. He delivered it in honour of the holy Virgin Mary, the mother of life for all of us, Jesus Christ our Lord. He related to us her birth and made it clear to everyone that it was a birth from a man and a woman, just as that of every human being. He also spoke about the day she came to rest. He pronounced this homily, or rather this eulogy, in her holy shrine, as he celebrated her feast together with all the orthodox people, on the day of the Commemoration of the True Queen, i.e. the 21th of the month of Tobe. In the peace of God. Amen.'

*Contents:*<sup>21</sup>

§§ 1–6:<sup>22</sup> *Introduction.* The author will not present his listeners with already familiar topics, but with something new. He then he lists the subjects previously discussed in earlier homilies (§§ 3–5; see below, p. 115).

§§ 7–9: *Mary was entirely human, and not a celestial force* (ΤΥΝΑΜΙC), as contended by the heretics Ebion and Arpocratius. The author will point out

<sup>21</sup> A summary and short discussion of the homily can also be found in Müller, *Die alte koptische Predigt*, 207–217.

<sup>22</sup> The sections are those of Campagnano's edition.



to which tribe she belonged and what the names of her parents were, 'according to the genealogies (Brit. Libr. Or. 6784: κενεολογια, M583: γενεα; or *Ancient Histories* M597: αρχηολογια) of Josephus and Irenaeus and according to what is written in the Scriptures' (§8).

§§ 10–23: *Mary's life until the return from Egypt*. Her father was Joachim, also called Cleopas, her mother was Anna. She was also called Mary Magdalene, Mary of Cleopas and Mary of James (§10). The author once again states that he found his story 'in the *Ancient Histories* (αρχηολογια, sic!) of Josephus and Irenaeus, Hebrews like me (!)' (§12). What is told about Mary's birth, her stay in the temple, the Annunciation, the Flight into Egypt, etc., agrees for the greater part with the well-known story of the *Protevangelium Jacobi* (§§13–23).

§§ 24–33: *Story of the heretic Annarichus*. A monk from Maiouma, near Gaza, named Annarichus, was summoned to explain his heretical teaching to Cyril. He called 'Sarton and Ebion, who came after him,' his spiritual fathers; Arpocratus is also mentioned. To prove his view about Mary, Annarichus refers to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which says (§28) that 'as Christ wanted to come down to men on earth, the Father called a force (δυναμις) in heaven, which was called Micha. He entrusted Christ to her and she descended to the world and was called Mary' (followed by a brief summary of Christ's life and death, *int. al.* 'As he was put on the wood of the cross, his Father saved him from their hands and brought him up to heaven, beside him in glory'). Cyril understands that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is written by Jews to distort the doctrines of the Church; Annarichus' teaching is worse than all the heresies described by Epiphanius in his *Ancoratus* (§31). The story ends with Annarichus' conversion to orthodox beliefs and his baptism at the feast of the Virgin (§33).

§§ 34–38: *Mary and Elizabeth; the pious life of the Virgin*.

§§ 39–47: *Last days of Mary*. Ten years after the resurrection of Christ, Mary asked John (with whom she lived in one house, 'according to the *Ancient Histories* (αρχηολογια) of Josephus and Irenaeus, who are from the Hebrews') to call Peter and James; they came immediately (§39). The Virgin reminds them of Jesus' crucifixion, resurrection and ascension (§§40–42), and then tells the apostles that Jesus has announced her death and asks them to call the virgins that are living together with her and to make preparations for her funeral (§§43–47).

§§ 48–51: *Prayer and death of the Virgin*. Mary thanks Christ for being allowed to be his mother and prays that she might be saved from the powers on her left and helped by those on her right (§§48–49). Christ appears

on his cherubim chariot with his angels, and her soul leaps into the embrace of her Son. The disciples close her eyes as she dies at the first hour of the night of the 21st of the month of Tobe (§ 50). Thereupon, Christ commands the disciples to bring her body to the valley of Josaphat and then to withdraw (§ 51).

§§ 52–53: *A vain endeavour of the Jews.* The Jews intend to burn Mary's body, but they could not find it; there was only a sweet scent. They were even unable to set fire to the wooden bier.

§§ 54–56: *Conclusion.* Mary lived for sixty years: fifteen years before she bore Christ, thirty years during his lifetime and fifteen years after his resurrection. She died on the 21st of the month of Tobe. Constantine and his son build the Virgin Mary Church, in which 'we celebrate her feast today, at her honourable Commemoration' (54). The congregation is exhorted to give alms to the poor and to praise the Virgin, and it is invited to the celebration of the Eucharist. (§§ 55–56).

The heading of the text gives a correct summary of the contents of the homily. That it is called Cyril's twenty-first homily, poses a problem which so far has not been satisfactorily resolved.<sup>23</sup> Of more interest is the information, not only in the superscription but also in the text itself, that the homily was delivered on the feast of the Commemoration (περνιμῆς) of Mary on the 21st of the month of Tobe, i.e. the 16th of January. This gives us an important clue to the homily's date of composition. Originally, the Commemoration of Mary was closely related to Christmas: Mary was primarily honoured as the mother of Christ. This changed around the beginning of the sixth century, as the apocryphal writings about the *Transitus Mariae* came into circulation and the emphasis began to shift to Mary's death and glorification.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See p. 116, n. 62 below.

<sup>24</sup> There are fragments in Manchester, Princeton, Utrecht and Vienna of three manuscripts containing a Coptic homily on the birth of Christ and the Virgin Mary that was held at the Commemoration of Mary. The fragments in Princeton and Utrecht belong to the same codex. The entire text is still unpublished, though Forbes Robinson already translated considerable parts of the Manchester manuscript in 1896 (*Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, xxii–xxiii, 196–197, 235–236). Moreover, Van Lantschoot edited and translated the sections from the Manchester manuscript which deal with topics from the *Physiologus* (see p. 10, n. 6), and I myself edited and translated the section on the Phoenix from the manuscripts in Manchester, Vienna and Utrecht in my *The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian traditions* (EPRO, 24), Leiden: Brill, 1972, see especially pp. 35–38 (on the development of the Commemoration of Mary). The fragment in Princeton was published by C.I.K. Story, 'A Coptic Christmas Story, and More,' *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 55 (1993–1994), 45–62.

The Coptic traditions concerning the death and assumption of the Virgin deviated in many respects from those that were current outside Egypt.<sup>25</sup> Initially, the feast of the 16th of January was the only celebration of Mary's death and assumption. In the course of the sixth century, however, the Egyptian church began to celebrate the *Assumption* of the Virgin on the 16th of Mesore, i.e. the 9th of August, but they continued to celebrate the Virgin's death, her *Dormition*, on the 16th of January. This change was most probably introduced by Theodosius of Alexandria, in a homily of AD 566/567.<sup>26</sup> Contrary to the liturgical usage of the Greek, Oriental and Latin churches, which celebrate Mary's Dormition and Assumption on one day, the 15th of August, the Egyptian and Ethiopian churches have continued celebrating the two Marian feasts until the present day. Pseudo-Cyril's *On the Virgin Mary* puts the Assumption (ⲁⲛⲁⲗⲱⲩⲓⲥ, § 48) of the Virgin on the 21st of Tobe (16th of January), which means that at least the narrative about her death must have been composed before the separation of the two feasts, that is to say before the middle of the sixth century. For the same reason, it is usually assumed that the entire homily has to be dated to the first half of the sixth century, which indeed is quite possible. Nevertheless, some caution may be in place, because later Coptic authors did not hesitate to present ancient though superseded liturgical traditions as still authoritative, as is evidenced

---

<sup>25</sup> The Coptic homilies on the Virgin Mary have always played an important part in studies about the Assumption of Mary, in which the homily by Pseudo-Cyril is commonly indicated as C2. See M. van Esbroeck, 'Les textes littéraires sur l'Assomption avant le X<sup>e</sup> siècle,' in F. Bovon et al., *Les actes apocryphes des apôtres. Christianisme et monde païen*, Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981, 265–285, especially 266–272 (reprinted in M. van Esbroeck, *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge. Études historiques sur les traditions orientales*, Aldershot, 1995, 1); S.C. Mimouni, *Dormition et Assomption de Marie. Histoire des traditions anciennes* (Théologie Historique, 98), Paris: Beauchesne, 1995, 173–210 ('La tradition copte'), especially 188–195; S.J. Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 57–63 ('The Coptic Tradition'). Gonzalo Aranda has written several articles on the Coptic traditions about Mary, which unfortunately were inaccessible to me: 'Maria en los Evangelios Apócrifos Coptos,' *Scripta de Maria* 1 (1978) 115–126; 'Maria en las narraciones coptas sobre el final de su vida en la tierra,' *Scripta de Maria* 2 (1979) 7–24; 'Tradiciones marianas apócrifas en las homilias coptas del pseudo-Cirilo de Jerusalén: I. Origen e infancia de Maria, nacimiento de Jesus,' *Scripta de Maria* 4 (1981) 101–122; 'Tradiciones marianas apócrifas en las homilias coptas del pseudo-Cirilo de Jerusalén: II. Resurreccion de Cristo, final de la vida de Maria,' *Scripta de Maria* 5 (1982) 29–50.

<sup>26</sup> Edited by M. Chaîne, 'Sermon de Théodose Patriarche d'Alexandrie sur la Dormition et l'Assomption de la Vierge,' *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 29 (1933–1934) 272–314; also published (but without the homily's beginning and end) by F. Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels. Translations with the Texts of Some of Them* (Texts and Studies, IV, 2), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896, 90–127 (text and translation).

by the insertion of the strange chronology of Holy Week in our *Homily on the Life and the Passion of Christ* (No. 1).<sup>27</sup> There is, however, another element in support of the view that the entire homily on Mary originated in the first half of the sixth century. The main purpose of the long story about the monk Annarichus and Cyril is to refute the view that Mary had not been an ordinary human being, but a heavenly power,—a view which according to Annarichus was to be found in the *Gospel of the Hebrews* and was also taught by Sarton (= Saturnilus?), Ebion, and Arpocratus (= Carpocrates?).<sup>28</sup> In another homily by Pseudo-Cyril, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, the same doctrine is ascribed to Antonius the Shoemaker and a certain Severus (see No. 2 above; § 6). It is also found in a homily *On the Virgin Mary*, which is attributed to Epiphanus of Salamis and claims to have been held on the 21st of Tobe. It deals extensively with the ancestors of the Virgin and the birth of Christ, but says nothing about Mary's Dormition and Assumption, which proves that this homily, too, must have been composed in the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century.<sup>29</sup> That the docetic view of Mary's body was indeed well known before the middle of the sixth century, appears also from the homily on the Virgin by Theodosius of Alexandria. In this homily, the author has Christ say to his mother: 'I did not want you to taste death but (I wanted) to translate you to the heavens as Enoch and Elias. But even they must also taste death at last. And if this happens to you [sc. an Assumption before death], evil men will think that you are a force (ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ) which came down from heaven and that this dispensation (οΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ) happened in appearance.'<sup>30</sup> These parallels make it altogether certain that Pseudo-Cyril's homily *On the Virgin* was indeed composed in the first half of the sixth century.

<sup>27</sup> See pp. 39–50 above.

<sup>28</sup> For the history of this view and the spuriousness of the 'quotation' from the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, see my study 'Der Bericht des koptischen Kyrillos von Jerusalem über das Hebräerevangelium,' in R. van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 39), Leiden: Brill, 1996, 142–156.

<sup>29</sup> Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts*, 122 (text), 701 (transl.): let no man say: 'If this Virgin is so highly exalted, then she cannot be of this earth, nor have been begotten by a man, but she must have come from heaven, as the fairy-tales of the worldly schismatics contend.' See also 'Sahidic Fragments of the Life of the Virgin,' I, 9 and 12, in Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, 2/3 and 4/5: 'Cursed is he who shall say that the Virgin was not born as we are. (...) she was conceived by man's seed as we are.'

<sup>30</sup> Chaîne, 'Sermon de Théodose,' 290–291 (text), 309 (transl.); Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, 108/109.

7. On the Holy Cross (*CPC 0120*)*Manuscripts:*

- a) Pierpont Morgan Library M599, fol. 1<sup>ro</sup>–31<sup>vo</sup> (pp. ⲁ–ⲭⲃ [1–62]); Facs. ed., vol. 15, 3–64 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 131–133, No. 65);
- b) Pierpont Morgan Library M600, fol. 2<sup>ro</sup>–45<sup>vo</sup> (pp. ⲁ–ⲡⲏ [1–88]); Facs. ed., vol. 16, 3–90 (Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 311–312, No. 160);
- c) British Library Or. 6799, fol. 2–40 (pp. ⲁ–ⲟⲏ [1–78]) (Layton, *Catalogue*, 89–90, No. 83);
- d) fragments of a manuscript from the White Monastery, kept in Vienna, Oxford, Paris (BN and Louvre), Naples, and Cairo.<sup>31</sup>

*Editions and translations:* Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts*, 183–230 (text = Brit. Lib. Or. 6799), 761–808 (translation); Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 75–149 (text and Italian translation, based on M600).<sup>32</sup>

*Superscription:* ‘A homily of our holy Apa Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, which he delivered in honour of the holy and luminous Cross and about the written word, which the Lord spoke to Moses: “Three times a year you shall keep a feast to me” (Exodus 23:14), and also about the luminous cross that appeared above the tomb of the Saviour, and about Isaac the Samaritan, whom he baptized. He delivered this homily on the site of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ on the seventeenth of the month of Thout, as he celebrated the feast of the Holy Cross together with all of the orthodox people and almost the entire city at the same time, while they glorified the Holy Cross. In the peace of God. Amen.’

*Contents:*<sup>33</sup>

§§1–13: *Introduction.* Biblical testimonies about the reign of Christ; he appeared as a human being, but acted as God.

§§14–36: *Isaac the Samaritan and Bachius the priest.* As many Christians travelled to Jerusalem to adore the Cross of Christ, Isaac the Samaritan of Joppe joined them with all his servants and all his possessions, though not

<sup>31</sup> According to CMCL and Buzi, *Catalogo*, 264, with additions by Suci, ‘The Borgian Coptic Manuscripts,’ 315, who offers a list of the pages of this reconstructed codex which contain passages of the *Homily On the Holy Cross*.

<sup>32</sup> §§14–32, 37–40, and 112–113 of Campagnano’s text (about Isaac the Samaritan) are also printed, with an English translation, in R. Pummer, *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism: Texts, Translations and Commentary* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 92), Tübingen: Mohr, 2002, 383–398.

<sup>33</sup> The sections are those of Campagnano’s edition.

to go to Jerusalem, but to the pool in Gibeon (ΓΚΑΒΔΟΝ; cf. 2 Samuel 2:13; Jeremiah 41:12), in which he wanted to purify his belongings (§§ 14–15). Together with the Christian pilgrims, his exhausted and thirsty company finally reached a pond, but the water proved to be foul and full of worms. Isaac blamed the Christians for this and spoke blasphemy against the Cross of Christ. A God-loving, orthodox priest, named Bachius, heard this and asked Isaac about his beliefs. Isaac told Bachius that Moses and Joshua gave him the Law, but also that the son of Mary was a prophet of God, whom the Jews had tried to crucify because he had broken the law of the Sabbath, but God had saved him from their hands: he had ascended a mountain and nobody knew what had happened to him. Thereupon the Jews had seized some robbers and crucified (with them) a certain Jesus, a prophet. That is the one the Christians believe in, whose cross they adore, and because of whom they are now in trouble. Bachius answers that Isaac's faith is vain and, alluding to the copper serpent of Moses (Numbers 21:8–9), he adds that the wood of the Cross would be able to destroy the spiritual serpent within Isaac (§§ 16–21). Then Isaac asks Bachius, who is here referred to as the archimandrite of a small monastery in the vicinity of Ascalon, which miracles have been performed by the Cross, adding that he would not believe in the Cross, even if Moses and Joshua told him to do so. Then Bachius utters a long prayer, tied two small pieces of wood together in the form of a cross and throws them into the pond, upon which the water becomes 'sweet like honey.' As Isaac and his men try to drink from the water, they see the small wooden cross as a burning torch deep down in the pond, but they are unable to drink from it, because the water proves to be very hot. Isaac is now convinced of the miraculous power of Christ and his cross, offering Bachius his possessions and asking him to make a cross for him so that he may adore it. Bachius refuses and advises him to go to Cyril in Jerusalem, who will tell him everything he needs to be saved. Thereupon, Apa Bachius made the sign of the cross over the water so that it also became drinkable for the converted Samaritans. After another story about the pond (its water is sweet for believers, but sour for the enemies of Christ), the Christian pilgrims and the company of Isaac travel to Jerusalem (§§ 22–36).

§§ 37–40: *Isaac the Samaritan and Cyril of Jerusalem.* Having arrived in Jerusalem, Isaac is taken to Cyril, who is celebrating the feast of the Cross in the Anastasis Church together with the people. Cyril already knows that the Samaritan has arrived, and for that reason he speaks of the love of God and his wish that the sinner may repent and live. Isaac is deeply impressed by these words and by what he sees in the church.

§§ 41–51: *Introduction to the story of the discovery of the Cross.* Rather unexpectedly, the author returns to the theme of the reign of Christ, which had already been the subject of §§ 1–13. The Cross is the symbol of the Son of Man that will appear in heaven (Matthew 24:30); just as Christ is in heaven and on earth, so it is with the Cross (§§ 41–44). Because time has advanced and so many people have come to celebrate the feast of the Cross and so many catechumens have to be baptized, finally some words must be said about Moses' instruction: 'Three times a year you shall keep a feast to me' (Exodus 23:14). Of these feasts, the author mentions the Passover and the feast of the Unleavened Bread, which refers to the death of Christ on the Cross, his resurrection and ascension, which again means: the Lord reigns! (§§ 45–48). But then the author refers to the feast of the first month of the year (which in fact is also that of the Passover and the Unleavened Bread, cf. Exodus 12; Numbers 9:1–5), and he asks: 'Which other feast is equal to this feast of today, which is celebrated in the first month of the year, namely the feast of the life-giving Cross?' He quotes Josephus and Irenaeus, 'who are from the Hebrews,' who asserted in their *Ancient Histories* (ἀρχαιολογία): 'There was a great wickedness in the heart of the Jews and they crucified their Lord on the wood of the Cross, which they wanted to hide.' After the Resurrection, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus decided to take away the Cross of Christ and those of the robbers, together with Pilate's inscription and the nails that had pierced Christ's hands and feet, and to put them into the tomb in which Jesus had been buried (§§ 49–51).

§§ 52–68: *The story of Cleopas and Rufus and the hiding of the tomb and the Cross.* A short time after the resurrection of Jesus, Rufus, the son of Cleopas, died and was buried near the tomb of Jesus. Cleopas was a rich but podagrous Jew, who could not walk. He had been opposed to the crucifixion of Jesus and he deplored that Jesus had died, because he would have been able to restore his son to life. Upon saying this, a fragrant smell and the form of a cross arose from the tomb of Jesus and settled on the corpse of his son. Rufus immediately got up and walked, and Cleopas, too, could walk again. As a result, many Jews believed in Christ, his cross and his resurrection (§§ 52–58). Thereupon the Jewish leaders first wanted to burn the Cross, but finally decided to hide it, together with the tomb. They issued a decree that the inhabitants of Jerusalem should dump all their rubbish and garbage on Golgotha. This decree remained in force until Vespasian destroyed the city. 'According to the description (Διατύπος) of Irenaeus and Philo' (§ 60), the Jews threw their rubbish on the tomb of Jesus during seventy-three years. After

the destruction of Jerusalem and the murder of 350,000 Jews, Vespasian instructed Ptolemee, the ruler of Egypt, to suppress the Egyptian Jews as much as possible. In the end, nobody remembered that the tomb of Jesus and his Cross were hidden under the enormous rubbish-heap of Golgotha. The sign of the Cross remained well-known, but the Cross itself had disappeared. For the disasters which had happened to the Jews, the author refers to the *Ancient Histories* (ἀρχαιολογία) of Josephus and Irenaeus, 'who are from the Hebrews' (§§ 59–68).

§§ 69–83: *Constantine and the vision of the Cross*. As the Emperor Constantine was at war with the Persians and afraid that he might loose the battle that was at hand, he saw among the stars a glorious cross of light surrounded by a text in Roman letters: 'Constantine, by this sign you shall gain the victory over all of them!' (§§ 69–73). At first, nobody knew which god had revealed himself through this sign, but then a young Christian officer, named Eusignius, informed Constantine that the sign belonged to Christ, who had been crucified by the Jews but had risen from the dead. Constantine immediately put a golden cross on his spear and another on his horse, and defeated the Persians in the battle that followed. During his rule as Emperor, he closed the pagan temples, had churches built everywhere and founded the city of Constantinople. Before Constantine died, he commanded his successor, his son Constantine, to go to Jerusalem and search there for the tomb of Jesus and his Cross (§§ 74–83).

§§ 84–108: *Constantine II and the rediscovery of the Cross*. After the death of Constantine, his son Constantine went to Jerusalem together with his mother Helena and questioned the Jewish leaders about the Cross in the tomb of Jesus. But neither these men nor seven experts in ancient Jewish law could or wanted to provide the Emperor with a satisfactory answer. Eventually, one of these seven experts, a certain Juda, was prepared to speak (§§ 84–89). He informed the Emperor of the enormous rubbish-heap created by his forefathers upon the tomb of Jesus, and added that the name of this location could be found in the Gospels. Constantine immediately commanded to bring the four Gospels, indeed finding there that Jesus had been buried at a place called Golgotha. Thereupon, Judas led the way to Golgotha, which according to him was also called Ephata. He advised the Emperor to summon all the Jews of his empire to Jerusalem, with their beasts and digging tools, in order to excavate the tomb of Jesus (§§ 90–93). Constantine immediately issued a decree to this effect and appointed surveyors who had to take care that the Jews would work day and night to excavate the tomb. Before returning to his affairs of state, Constantine left his mother Helena and two thousand soldiers with their



officers in Jerusalem, together with archbishop Christodorus of Antioch and archbishop Joseph of Jerusalem, who was the fourteenth Jewish-Christian bishop since the apostles. Helena set the Jews to work, and they had to dig from the twelfth of March, i.e. Phamenoth, to the sixteenth of Thout before they were able to reach the top of the tomb. Helena and the archbishops went to the tomb to adore it; then Juda digged at the east side of the tomb and discovered its opening (§§ 94–97). The next day they found three crosses in the tomb, together with a letter written by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, saying that they had hidden the three crosses in the tomb of Jesus and that the cross with the *titulus* was that of Jesus. Helena informed her son Constantine of the discovery of the cross, and the Emperor immediately came to Jerusalem to adore the cross and the tomb of Jesus. He gave instructions to build a magnificent church near the tomb, which became known as the ‘Holy Resurrection’ (ἁγία ἀναστάσις), and another church near Golgotha, which was called the ‘Venerable Cross’ (τιμιον ἴκρον). The churches were consecrated by archbishop Joseph of Jerusalem and other orthodox bishops. The first service in the Resurrection Church was held on the seventeenth of the month Thout, the day on which the cross had been found. As they were about to celebrate the eucharist, there appeared a luminous cross above the tomb from the early morning until the ninth hour, after which it was taken up into heaven. Because of this miracle, many Jews and pagans came to believe in Christ and were baptized (§§ 98–106). After the death of bishop Joseph [M599 erroneously reads: James], Juda, who had disclosed the site of the tomb, became the fifteenth Jewish-Christian bishop of Jerusalem after the apostles. As Juda died, he was succeeded by Mark, the first non-Jewish bishop of Jerusalem. The author ends by stating that today it is the day of the discovery of the Cross and that of the consecration of the two churches, to which he now adds that on this day, too, Constantine founded the city of Constantinople (§§ 107–108).

§§ 109–111: *Warning against a christological heresy.* We should not only glorify Christ with our tongues but also with our hearts. The author refers to what the Physiologus says about the giraffe: its hind-part has the form of a camel, but it is able to eat from the top of high trees thanks to its long neck. In the same manner, there are heretics who do not stick to one view: on the one hand they celebrate the Eucharist to (the divine) Christ, but on the other hand they regard him as a mere human being. They read the Scriptures and the Gospels as sayings made by men. The author exhorts his listeners to adhere to one consistent view of Christ. They should profess with their hearts and mouths: ‘Emmanuel is God who has taken

flesh, his divine nature τεϥμῆτνοϥτε) is not separated from his human nature (τεϥμῆτρωμε), but he has greatly glorified us because he clothed himself with the flesh. He is uncompounded (αϥγῆνοντον, ἀσύνητος) God from the substance (οϥϥια) of the Father, who has made the cross his altar on which he offered up his divine and human flesh. He is himself the holy One (ππετοϥααβ; or read ποϥηνβ, 'priest?') and he is also the lamb and the sacrifice; he is also the one who sacrifices himself and who receives the sacrifice.'

§§ 112–113: *The baptism of Isaac*. Without any transitional phrase, the author asks Isaac the Samaritan whether he believes what he has learned from Bachius and understands what has been said in 'this catechesis (καθηγησις).' Isaac reponds with a baptismal confession, and is then baptized, together with his servants.

The superscription offers a rather arbitrary impression of the contents of the text. Apart from the general theme of the glorification of the Cross, only three specific topics are mentioned. Two of them receive only little attention in the text itself: the meaning of Exodus 23:14 is briefly discussed in §§ 45 ff. and the appearance of the luminous cross above the tomb of Jesus is related in § 106. The story of Isaac the Samaritan indeed takes up an important part of the homily, but the long story about the discovery of the cross and the miracles connected with the cross are not mentioned in the superscription at all.

Pseudo-Cyril sometimes directly addresses his congregation, which to a certain extent gives the impression that *On the Holy Cross* is a real homily. In fact, however, it is not a homily but a collection of stories about the miraculous power of the Holy Cross and its discovery. The long story about Isaac the Samaritan is not known from other sources and reveals an astonishing ignorance about the actual beliefs and rituals of the Samaritans.<sup>34</sup> That Isaac is said to believe that Jesus the son of Mary was a prophet of God, whom the Jews wanted to crucify because he abolished the Sabbath, but who was saved from their hands by God (§ 17), suggest that he was a Samaritan-Christian heretic. But it is by no means certain that the story contains a historical kernel of fact, for similar ideas are also ascribed to the heretical

<sup>34</sup> See Pummer, *Early Christian Authors*, 384–385: 'There are hardly any features that can be connected with the Samaritans; even the allusions to supposed Samaritan beliefs contained in the account are distorted and misconstrued' (384). Except for Pseudo-Cyril's *On the Holy Cross*, Isaac is not mentioned in any of Plummer's 170 early Christian and early Byzantine texts about the Samaritans.

monk Annarichus in Pseudo-Cyril's *On the Virgin*, 28.<sup>35</sup> The story of the discovery of the Cross is a free rendering of the so-called Judas Cyriacus Legend, which originated in Syria and finally outstripped the older and less complicated Helena Legend, in which the Jew Judas was still completely absent.<sup>36</sup> There are, however, some important deviations of the original Judas Cyriacus Legend in Pseudo-Cyril's version, which again betray an astonishing lack of historical knowledge. Only two of them may be mentioned here. Helena is no longer the mother of Constantine the Great, but his wife and the mother of Constantine II. As in the original Judas Cyriacus Legend, the Judas who reveals the site of the tomb to Helena later on becomes the bishop of Jerusalem, though Pseudo-Cyril does not give him the Christian name Cyriacus, but identifies him instead with the fifteenth and last Jewish Christian bishop of Jerusalem, who succeeded Joseph, the fourteenth bishop. Judas' successor is said to be a certain Mark, the first non-Jewish bishop of Jerusalem. Here the author associates Helena (248/9–328/9) with Judas, the last Jewish-Christian bishop of Jerusalem, who was succeeded by the gentile Christian Mark in AD 135,—a tradition that ultimately derives from the church historian Eusebius.<sup>37</sup> In § 49, he takes the 'first month of the year' mentioned in Exodus 12 and Numbers 9:1–5 (which in fact is the month of Nisan / Parmoute = 27/3–25/4) as the first month of the Egyptian year, i.e. the month of Thout (= 29/8–27/9). Just as in the homily *On the Virgin Mary*, there are several references to and 'quotations' from the *Ancient Histories* of Josephus and Irenaeus (§§ 49, 68), and also a reference to descriptions by Philo and Irenaeus (§ 60). By making these references, the author apparently intended to give a flavour of historical reliability to his account, but the fact alone that he holds Irenaeus to be a Jewish historian proves that he had a very poor historical knowledge. The homily cannot possibly be an authentic work of Cyril of Jerusalem, but its real date is very difficult to ascertain. It has some features in common with the homily *On the Virgin*, which might

<sup>35</sup> See p. 94.

<sup>36</sup> There is also a third version, the Protonica Legend (the Cross found by the wife of the Emperor Claudius); see J.W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding of the True Cross*, Leiden: Brill, 1992; on the Judas Cyriacus Legend, 165–180.

<sup>37</sup> Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV, 5, 1–4 (the fifteen Jewish bishops of Jerusalem, until AD 135) and IV, 6, 4 (Marcus). On the notorious problem of too many Jewish bishops for too short a period of time, see R. van den Broek, 'Der Brief des Jakobus an Quadratus und das Problem der judenchristlichen Bischöfe von Jerusalem (Eusebius, *HE* IV, 5, 1–3),' in T. Baarda, A. Hilhorst et al. (eds.), *Text and Testimony. Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1988, 56–65.

be an indication that both homilies were composed in the same milieu and time. We shall return to this question at the end of this chapter.

#### 8. On Mary Magdalene (*CPC 0118*)

##### *Manuscripts:*

- a) IFAO [= Institut français de l'archéologie orientale, Cairo] Copt. 27, 10 folio's (pp. ̄̄̄̄ [1–2] and ̄̄̄̄̄̄ [15–32]), ed. Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 169–212;
- b) some pages of probably the same codex: b.1. Folio Chaleur, first publication: S. Chauleur, 'Deux pages d'un manuscrit sur la Vierge,' *Cahiers Coptes* 12 (1956) 3–5, with 2 plates; ed. (with French translation) Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 197–198, 201; b.2. Pierpont Morgan M665(4), 2 folio's (pp. ̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄ [131–132] and ̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄ [141–142]; Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 213, No. 110); ed. (with French transl.) P.-H. Poirier, 'Fragments d'une version copte de la *Caverne des Trésors*,' *Orientalia* 52 (1983) 415–423; French translation in Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 210–212).

*Superscription* (IFAO, Copt. 27, p. 1): 'A homily of the wise man in divine things and archbishop Apa Cyril of Jerusalem, which he delivered about the holy and noble Mary Magdalene. He started with her early youth (and continued) until her death and revealed her entire life, from which family she came. He also spoke about the seven impure spirits which dwelled within her and revealed how God had kept her a holy virgin ... (?) before she (came) to the world.<sup>38</sup> He also spoke about her conduct (ⲧⲉⲥⲉⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉ) with respect to the Saviour and her other six cousins. He also spoke about the way the crown was placed upon her and how she (was brought) to Egypt<sup>39</sup>

<sup>38</sup> The Coptic text reads: ⲉϣⲟϣⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲡⲉⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲱⲟⲗ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲁⲣⲉ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲉⲟⲥⲟⲥ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛⲁⲃⲓ ⲉⲁⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲥⲱⲓ ⲉⲡⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ The Coptic of the manuscript is sometimes irregular and full of scribal errors. Coquin and Godron have apparently reproduced the text as it is found in the manuscript, but they have not attempted to present a critical edition of the text: obvious errors are not indicated, emendations not suggested (see also next notes). The last four words of the quotation at the beginning of this note are difficult to translate (Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 200: '(...) avant qu'elle (...) au monde'). The word ⲛⲁⲃⲓ seems corrupt, whereas ⲉⲁⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲥⲱⲓ should probably be read as ⲉⲁⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲥⲉⲓ ('before she came to the world').

<sup>39</sup> The Coptic text reads: ⲁⲥⲉⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲉⲁⲓ ⲉⲕⲛⲙⲉ, which Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 200, translate as 'sa descente en Égypte.' As the coronation of Mary refers to her death, probably her martyrdom, it seems likely that the form ⲁⲥⲉⲙⲉ should be corrected

and about the miracles which God performed through her,<sup>40</sup> and that she resembled<sup>41</sup> the holy Theotokos Saint Mary, the true Mother of God, and that she was her sister; and that the day she went to rest was the 23th of the month of Paōne. In the peace of God. May (her) holy blessings (νε(с)сμοу) come down upon us together.'

*Contents:*

*IFAO Copt. 24, pp. 1–2: Introduction.* Mary Magdalene remained a virgin from her birth to her death. Christ loved her, made her closely united to him and revealed to her the hidden mysteries. The author will reveal the life of Mary Magdalene, 'as I found it in the library of the Holy City, written in Egyptian (εϥснε нєкнптїос).'

*Folio Chaleur: Mary Magdalene's family.* [If this folio really belongs to the same homily as IFAO Copt. 24, it should be placed in the lacuna of the IFAO text (pp. 3–14), as done by Coquin and Godron]. The story about Mary's descent and family relations is told by a certain Simon, 'eunuch and secretary' (ΔΝΟΚ ΠΕ СΙΜΩΝ ΔΝΟΚ ΟΥСІΟΥΡ ННОТАΡΙОС [sic! = ННОТАΡΙОС]), to whom Mary's father at his death had entrusted all his possessions and the care of his children. Mary Magdalene's father David had a daughter called Anna from his first marriage, who later on became the mother of the Virgin Mary. After his wife's death he remarried a woman called Synklētikē, who gave birth to a daughter called Mary Magdalene. After her parents death, Mary's half-sister Anna took care of the Magdalene, who as a young girl looked after Anna's own child, Mary Theotokos.

*IFAO Copt. 24, p. 15: the feeding of five thousand people.* After the lacuna the text resumes with the story of Mark 6:35–44 parr. and John 6:1–13, told by the apostles themselves. The name of the boy who had five loaves and two

---

into αϥεїνε ('they brought her / she was brought'). Unfortunately, the pages of the manuscript which related these events have been lost. Nothing is known about Mary's stay in Egypt from other traditions.

<sup>40</sup> The text as printed by Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 175, reads: нєωпнρε нта пноуτċ ααϥ ϣтгоотċ. Assuming that there are no printing errors here, the text should of course be read as нтапноуτє ααϥ ϣтгоотċ.

<sup>41</sup> Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 175, print: нтос тє со нпροсοпон and translate: 'elle est la représentante.' They take со as a vulgar Sahidic form of са, 'maker of' (with reference to R. Kasser, *Compléments au Dictionnaire Copte de Crum* [Bibliothèque d'Études Coptes, VII], Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1964, 52a): 'ainsi le copte serait la traduction du grec «προσωποιός»' (sic!; with reference to Lampe, *Lexicon*, 1189b, s.v. προσωποποιός). In my view the text should be read as нтос тєсо нпροсοпон (-ο being the qualitative of εїρε), which indeed could mean: 'she represents,' but more probably means: 'she looks like / resembles' (for she is said to be Mary's sister).

fishes (John 6:9) was Philemon. At that time Mary Magdalene was part of the company of Jesus. The pieces that were left over were given to her, 'so that she could serve us from them at meal-time.'

*IFAO Copt. 27, pp. 15–17: Mary Magdalene, Herod and Tiberius.* Within a month a caravan of pack animals loaded with valuables reached the company of Jesus. The caravan had been sent by Theophilus, 'the steward of the property of the Magdalene,' who in a letter to his mistress informed her that he had been forced to pay three pounds of gold, apparently to Herod, to ensure that the convoy would reach her. Thereupon Mary decides to write a letter about Herod's misconduct to the Emperor Tiberius, which is delivered to the emperor by John the son of Zebedee. The Emperor writes 'to the land of Judaea' that anyone who opposes Mary Magdalene shall be decapitated and his possession shall revert to the imperial treasury. At John's request, the Emperor also wrote to Herod that he must not harm John. At this point the story is unexpectedly interrupted by an insertion about the feeding of four thousand people with five loaves, again told by the disciples (Mark 8:1–10; Matthew 15:32–39): 'Christ came to the Sea of Tiberias. He blessed another five loaves; four thousand men ate and were satisfied. Seven baskets were filled with the remains; we brought them to our mistress the Magdalene and she kept serving us from them.'<sup>42</sup> After this insertion, the story of John's mission is continued, but due to the bad state of the manuscript the course of events remains unclear. It ends with the words: '... because of the order of the Emperor Caesar.'

*IFAO Copt. 27, pp. 17–20: Christ's burial and resurrection.* Without any transition the story of Mary Magdalene continues with her role at the burial of Jesus. She went to Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea and asked them to request Jesus' body and to bury it, but they advised her to go the Pilate herself, 'because the Emperor's order is in your hands.' She answered that being a woman she could not go herself, and urged them to give money to Pilate in order to obtain the body of Jesus, which they did. But Pilate refused to accept the money and gave them permission for the burial, which is told in accordance with Matthew 27:57–60 parr. and John 19:38–41. Mary Magdalene informs Mary the mother of Jesus of what has happened. The Resurrection is only briefly mentioned, and concludes with Mark 16:8. The story then continues with John 20:11–12:

---

<sup>42</sup> Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 202, translate this passage as part of Tiberius' letter.

Mary Magdalene is told by the angels that Christ has risen from the dead, but unfortunately, due to severe damage to the manuscript, the passage is for the greater part illegible. As Peter and John had seen the empty tomb (John 20:3–10), they told Mary Theotokos that her son had risen, but they could not convince her, nor could Mary Magdalene. The mother of Jesus said to her: ‘My sister, where is my son?’ The Magdalene answered that she had not seen him.<sup>43</sup> Then the story of the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene (John 20:14–18) changes into one about an appearance to the Virgin Mary, the mother of Jesus. Mary Magdalene is now said to have witnessed the event, because she stood at the entrance of the tomb (cf. John 20:11!). The reason why Jesus forbids his mother to touch him (John 20:17) is interesting: ‘I have not made myself a stranger to you, but it is because you have been disobedient: you have left the house of John, you have gone into the midst of the defiled Jews, so that the dust of their feet fell on your garments, those which I did not give to be defiled at any time. It is impossible that the dust of the those godless people touches the garment that I have put upon me before I ascend in it to my Father’ (pp. 19b, 26–20a, 12).

*IFAO Copt. 27, pp. 20–21: The Virgin Mary’s death and the writings of the apostles.* Fifteen years after the resurrection of Christ, Mary Theotokos died at the 21st of the month of Tobe. Before her death she assembled all the apostles and appointed Mary Magdalene as their head, whom they should obey. Paul, ‘the man from Tarsus,’ arrived before the apostles departed to preach the Gospel, and the apostles wrote their Gospels and Letters. The Holy Ghost descended upon them and Christ came to them every day and taught them ‘the canons and the regulations of the eucharist’ (!). Paul and Peter each wrote a Gospel and the Holy Ghost gave them to Luke and Mark respectively; and John wrote his Gospel about the Word that became flesh. The unknown speaker says of himself: ‘I took the Psalter.’ Paul, too, wrote his fourteen letters. The apostles took these writings with them as they departed to Egypt and the regions further to the south. The speaker, apparently, was not one of the apostles, for he concludes this section with the words: ‘We, however, we stayed in Jerusalem and the Saviour came to visit the holy Magdalene and instructed her about many hidden mysteries.’

<sup>43</sup> Coquin and Godron, ‘Un encomion copte,’ 203, erroneously translate: ‘La Vierge dit à ma sœur: “Mon fils est ressuscité, as-tu dit?”’ The Coptic should be read, p. 19a, 14–18: π[ε]χ[α]c ἡ β[ι]τ[α] π[α]ρ[ο]ε[ν]oc] xε τ[α]c ω[ν]e ε[ν] τ[ω] n πα[ω]ν[ρ]e π[ε]χ[α]c] xε ἡ π[ε]ν[α]ν[υ] ε[ρ]ο[υ]c ἀ[ν]οκ.

*IFAO Copt. 27, pp. 21–24: first revelations by the angel Gabriel.* One day, as Mary Magdalene discussed God's inspired scriptures with Theophilus, her steward (ἐπαρχος), the latter expressed his confusion about the meaning of the scriptures and the often conflicting genealogies of the ancients (ἡκνεεαλοκεια ἡἡαρχαιον).<sup>44</sup> Thereupon Mary turned her face to the east and uttered a prayer in Hebrew. Immediately the archangel Gabriel appeared and Mary asked him to reveal to Theophilus the fulfilment of the scriptures and the dispensation (οἰκονομία) of the Saviour. Theophilus makes clear what he wants to have clarified, from the creation of Adam to the present day: the tribe to which Christ belonged, why the Jews fight the Christians, the deluge and how the skull of Adam came to Golgotha, 'for some say that the Flood brought it there, others, however, (tell it) with other words; they have not been able to establish the truth about it.' Furthermore he wants to know how idolatry arose, on which day Adam and Eve were created, and what Eve's true nature was, 'because the Hebrews dispute whether she came into being herself; others, however, (say) that she came forth from the devil, but in Genesis (it is said) that God said: "He brought a sleep upon Adam, took one of his ribs and created Eve" (Genesis 2:21–22).' Gabriel begins his response to these questions by saying that God created Adam from virginal earth, left him without a spirit (πῠα) for forty days<sup>45</sup> and returned to heaven with his angels. Thereupon the devil came down to Adam in Paradise and promised to give him a spirit, but Adam did not move. 'God weeped on his throne and said: "I regret that I have made man complete, except that my only begotten Son has taken responsibility for him,"<sup>46</sup> because he had left him without giving him a spirit.'

*IFAO Copt. 27, pp. 24–32: Continuation of Gabriel's revelation: Cave of Treasures, 2–6.* From p. 24a, 20 to the end, the IFAO manuscript reproduces chapters 2–6 of the *Cave of Treasures*, a well-known Syriac apocryphon

<sup>44</sup> This expression, especially the form ἀρχαιον instead of ἀρχαιος, suggests a Greek original: αἱ γενεαλογίαι τῶν ἀρχαίων, i.e. the genealogical lists of the primeval people who lived before the Flood (which are discussed later on in this writing). Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 204, translate: 'les généalogies anciennes.'

<sup>45</sup> For this originally Jewish idea, which *int. al.* also occurs in the gnostic *On the Origin of the World*, 81 (NHC II, 115, 9–110), see L. Painchaud, *L'Écrit sans titre. Traité sur l'origine du monde (NH II, 5 et XIII, 2 et Brit. Lib. Or. 4926[1])* (Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, Section "Textes," 21), Quebec-Louvain: Les Presses de l'Université Laval-Éditions Peeters, 1995, 405.

<sup>46</sup> Coquin and Godron, 'Un encomion copte,' 206, translate: 'à moins que mon fils unique ne se porte garant de lui' (Coptic: ἡσάβηλ ἡ πατρὲς ἡ μονογενὴς οὗ τὸν τῶν ἡμον).



which has been edited with a French translation by Su-Min Ri.<sup>47</sup> Chapter 2 is found on pp. 24–26 of the manuscript; chapter 3 on pp. 26–27; chapter 4 on pp. 27–28; chapter 5 on pp. 28–31; and chapter 6 on pp. 31–32. There is no need to reproduce here the contents of these pages, for Pseudo-Cyril follows the text of the *Cavern* very closely, although there are sometimes minor additions or abridgements.

*Pierpont Morgan M 665(4): Cave of Treasures, 44 and 47.* The first folio (pp. 131–132) begins with *Cave of Treasures, 44, 12* and a summary of 44, 12–18, followed by the genealogical list of 44, 19–31 (translation Su-Min Ri, 131–135). The second folio (pp. 141–142) starts with *Cave of Treasures, 47, 12*, followed by a summary and a partly literal translation of 47, 13–25 and the beginning of chapter 48. That M 665(4) contains parts of the same *Homily on Mary Magdalene* as is found in IFAO Copt. 27 is confirmed by the fact that both on p. 131a, 26 and p. 142b, 22 the receiver of the revelation is addressed as ‘Theophilus’ (θεοφιλε).

The superscription may be a rather fair summary of the work’s contents. The stories that are referred to but not found in the extant parts of the manuscripts may have been told on the missing pages (the seven impure spirits, Mary’s virginity, her conduct with respect to Christ and her six cousins and her ‘coronation’ and stay in Egypt). The work is called a ‘homily’ (λογος), ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem, but the preserved sections do not contain anything to substantiate this claim: the congregation is never addressed, there are no ethical exhortations or conclusions. It is an apocryphal work, in which the author managed to combine a variety of traditions about Mary Magdalene with an almost literally reproduction of a great part of the *Cave of Treasures*, which he presented as a revelation by the archangel Gabriel to Theophilus, the steward of Mary Magdalene (in the Syriac *Cave* the receiver of the revelation is called Namosaya). The generally accepted date of the *Cave of Treasures* is around the beginning of the sixth century,<sup>48</sup> which makes it absolutely certain that Cyril of Jerusalem cannot have been the author of the ‘homily.’ The presence of the *Cave of Treasures* in a Coptic apocryphon raises a lot of questions that can only be dealt with in a thorough investigation of all problems involved. There is no doubt that the author of the homily on Mary Magdalene made use of a Greek or

<sup>47</sup> Su-Min Ri, *La Caverne des trésors: Les deux recensions syriaques* (CSCO 486 [text] and 487 [translation]), Louvain: Peeters, 1987. The French translation of the passage which corresponds to IFAO Copt. 27, 24–32, is to be found in CSCO 487, 7–23.

<sup>48</sup> See Su-Min Ri, *La Caverne des Trésors*, CSCO 487, XVII–XVIII: ‘vers le début du 6<sup>e</sup> siècle.’

Coptic translation of the *Cave of Treasures*, which he often quoted literally and sometimes summarized. It is noteworthy that his text shows readings that in the Syriac tradition are distributed over the two existing versions, which makes the character of his source uncertain. It also remains uncertain whether his source was a Greek text, translated from the Syriac, or a direct Coptic translation of a Greek or Syriac original. The editor of M665(4), Paul-Hubert Poirier, suggested an original Coptic translation, but the editors of IFAO Copt. 27 argued that the whole homily on Mary Magdalene, including the borrowing from the *Cave of Treasures*, must be a Coptic translation of a Greek original. According to Coquin and Godron, their view is confirmed by the following observations: the biblical names are those of the Greek Septuagint, not of the Syriac Peshiṭta; the syntax of the work is very un-Coptic and points to a Greek substrate; and frequent use is made of Greek morphology. The syntax is indeed often remarkable and uncommon, though this does not necessarily point to a Greek background. Although there are occasional expressions which might betray a Greek source of the passage involved (cf.  $\overline{\text{NK}}\overline{\text{NE}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{LOKEIA}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{PXAION}}$ , above p. 109), there are also indications that at least the apocryphon on Mary Magdalene is an original Egyptian production: the author claims that he found her story in a book that was written 'in Egyptian' and he says that the apostles used their Gospels and Letters for their mission in Egypt and its southern regions; moreover, according to the superscription, the text recounts that Mary Magdalene went to Egypt, probably to obtain martyrdom. The Coptic *Homily on Mary Magdalene* is a very interesting work which deserves a new critical edition, translation and a commentary, paying full attention to the relationship between its version of the *Cave of Treasures* and the Syriac tradition of this writing.

## 2. A Cyrillian Cycle?

There are unmistakable interconnections between some of the Coptic homilies that are attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem. This has led to the hypothesis of a 'Cyrillian Cycle' of homilies, which, like other cycles associated with famous ecclesiastical writers, came 'from a single late period and were produced by a homogeneous literary school.'<sup>49</sup> The attribution to Cyril alone does not, of course, prove any kind of interrelationship or interdependence

<sup>49</sup> Orlandi, 'Coptic Literature,' 78–80 (quotation on p. 78); also idem, 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme,' 95–100; Campagnano, *Omèlie copte*, 10–14; Orlandi, 'Patristica copta e patristica greca,' 334; idem, 'Cycle,' in *Coptic Encyclopedia* (1991), 3, 666–668.

between the texts that go under his name. Pseudonymity was a widespread phenomenon both in Greek and Coptic religious literature. In some of the Cyrillian homilies, there is clear internal evidence that the author wanted to present himself as Cyril of Jerusalem, by speaking about himself as Cyril the archbishop of Jerusalem and by relating events that had happened in his time. But that does not necessarily imply that they were produced in the same spiritual workshop, for the same features are also to be observed in homilies ascribed to other authors, even in those of undisputed authenticity.<sup>50</sup> Three 'Cyrillian' homilies do not contain any internal reference to Cyril as the author or show any sign of interrelationship with the other homilies, although one of them is incomplete, namely *On Mary Magdalene* (No. 8 above). The other two are *On the Resurrection and the Passion* (No. 4 above) and *On New Sunday* (No. 5 above).<sup>51</sup> There is no reason whatsoever to assign them to a specific Cyrillian cycle.

The most obvious of the interconnections between the remaining five Cyrillian homilies has not been noticed in previous research. It is the appearance of the priest Bachius in the homilies *On the Holy Cross* (No. 6 above) and *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* (No. 1 above, text and translation below). In *On the Holy Cross*, 14–36 and 112, Bachius plays an important part in the conversion of Isaac the Samaritan. He is said to have been the archimandrite of a small monastery in the vicinity of Ascalon, who accompanies Isaac on his journey to Jerusalem. In the homily *On the Life and the Passion of Christ*, 8, the same Bachius appears as a dignitary at Cyril's episcopal palace, an expert in shorthand, who has been ordained bishop by Cyril himself, 'by the command of God and the vote of the whole people.'<sup>52</sup> The fact that Bachius has moved higher up the hierarchical ladder in *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* shows that its author knew *On the Holy Cross* and consequently wrote his work at a later date. Our discussion of these homilies has led to the conclusion that the date of *On the Holy Cross* remains uncertain and that *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* can hardly be older than the late eighth or the early ninth century.<sup>53</sup> Both works might derive from the same author or

---

<sup>50</sup> An example of an evidently pseudonymous work is provided by Pseudo-Theophilus of Alexandria, *On the Virgin Mary*, ed. W.H. Worrell, *The Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, New York–London: MacMillan, 1923, 249–322 (text), 359–380 (transl.); an almost certainly authentic work with the same characteristics is Benjamin of Alexandria, *On the Wedding of Cana*, in De Vis, *Homélies coptes*, I, 56–106.

<sup>51</sup> That the author of *On New Sunday* knew a specific tradition of the worldly professions of the disciples does not point to a special relationship with *On the Life and the Passion of Christ*; see p. 19.

<sup>52</sup> See p. 99 above and p. 127 below.

<sup>53</sup> See pp. 104–105 and 69–70.

from a specific group of authors who produced their 'homilies' in one and the same spiritual workshop. In that case we have to accept that the homily *On the holy Cross* was also composed around the beginning of the ninth century. It is also conceivable, however, that this homily was written at an earlier date and that the author of *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* consciously introduced Bachius in order to connect his work with the popular Cyrillian homily on the rediscovery of the Cross, thereby reinforcing his claim that Cyril was the author.

There might be still another connection between *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* and some of the other homilies that went under the name of Cyril of Jerusalem. In § 154, the author says that it is time to bring his sermon to an end, but he promises that more is to follow, § 155:

And we know that we owe you more, but if God leaves us in the body we shall fulfil what we are due and we shall inform you about how Christ was crucified and how Joseph and Nicodemus prepared his body for burial and put it into a tomb and how he rose from the dead on the third day and how he appeared to her who has brought him forth, Mary, the holy Virgin, according to the testimony of the Son of Thunder, John the Evangelist.

This passage can be explained in various ways: 1. The author announces homilies about the Crucifixion and the Resurrection which he intends to compose in the future. If he indeed realized this plan, it might have resulted in the existing Cyrillian homilies on these subjects, which would then be posterior to the homily *On the Life and the Passion of Christ*; 2. he refers to already existing homilies on the Crucifixion and the Resurrection under the name of Cyril, which would then predate the homily *On the Life and the Passion of Christ*; 3. He did not think of any existing or future works but simply wanted to indicate that much more had to be told about the passion, the burial and the resurrection of Christ, but that enough had been said for the present.

Given the fact that there are three other Cyrillian homilies on the subject of the Passion and the Resurrection, it is pertinent to ask which of these fits best with the passage quoted above. The homily *On the Resurrection* (No. 3) can be excluded, for in this homily the appearance of Christ to Mary is not mentioned but presupposed.<sup>54</sup> The episode of his appearance has already been narrated in the homily, *On the Passion and the Resurrection* (No. 2), 36–39, to which the homily *On the Resurrection* is a sequel. In this homily,

---

<sup>54</sup> See p. 80.

the Crucifixion and its implications are extensively discussed (§§9–25), but the burial is only briefly mentioned, without reference to Nicodemus (§29).<sup>55</sup> If Pseudo-Cyril referred to one or more already existing Cyrillian homilies about the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, he might have had *On the Passion and the Resurrection* in mind. However, he might also, and even more probably, have been thinking of the homily *On the Resurrection and the Passion* (No. 4), for that strange Easter homily contains a very circumstantial exposition of the events of the Passion and Resurrection (pp. 11–52), mainly according to John 19 and 20.<sup>56</sup> This is the only text which agrees with the remark in *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* that ‘Joseph and Nicodemus prepared his body for funeral,’ for it explicitly states, in accordance with John 19:39–42, that Joseph and Nicodemus prepared Jesus’ body before they laid it into the tomb: ‘They took the holy body of Christ, they washed it; they washed it because it was defiled with blood. They provided it with frankincense and perfumes according to their customs and wrapped it in linen sheets of great value.’<sup>57</sup> Although it remains highly speculative, the author of *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* most probably had the homily *On the Resurrection and the Passion* in mind if he was really considering already existing homilies on the Passion and the Resurrection. The structure of this work points to a later, drastic, revision of an original Easter homily, although it is hardly conceivable that both works were produced by the same author or even the same ‘school.’ The homily *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* shows a strong predilection for apocryphal materials and interesting stories, whereas this aspect is completely absent from *On the Resurrection and the Passion*, or from the other Cyrillian homilies on the same subjects. However, these speculations cannot be corroborated by fact, and the author of *On the Life and the Passion of Christ* may have simply thought of the stories in the Gospel of John. In any case, we are left with one undeniable fact, namely that he knew the homily *On the Holy Cross*, as testified by his introduction of the priest Bachius.

Before presenting the evidence of interrelationship between the remaining four Cyrillian homilies, it may be useful to quote a passage of *On the Virgin Mary* which from the beginning has played an important part in the

<sup>55</sup> See p. 78.

<sup>56</sup> See pp. 83–86.

<sup>57</sup> M595, p. 43b.19–28 (Facsimile Edition, Vol. 43, p. 45): ἀρχὴ δὲ ἡπικνωμα ἐτοῦδαβ ἡπικτ ἀχχοκνῆφ ἀγείδαφ ἐβολ ἐφτολῆ ἡσνοφ. ἀγτ ἐροφ ἡρενηνηε μῆ ρενστοι κατὰ πεῦσωντ ἀγκοοσφ ἡρενσιν. ἀδων ἐναφρε σοῦεντοῦ.

debate on the 'Cyrillian Cycle'.<sup>58</sup> Pseudo-Cyril makes clear that he wants to tell his audience something new. He freely quotes Matthew 13:52: 'Therefore, the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a house who produces from his store new and old things,' and continues some lines further.<sup>59</sup>

3. For I have first told you about him who took flesh and became man for us and how he received baptism in the river Jordan by John and how the Holy Spirit bodily came down upon him in the form of a dove.

I have also told you about the sufferings which Christ took upon him on the cross and about his death and his resurrection from the dead and how he ascended to heaven while all saw him and he sat at the right hand of the Father and that he is coming to judge the living and the dead.

I have also told you about the Spirit, the Paraclete, that he is in the Father and the Father in him with the beloved Son, one Divinity, one Lordship, who are immutable and unchangeable; and that the Antichrist must come, whose reign will be brief.

4a.<sup>60</sup> I have also told you about the disturbances which the Son of Destruction will raise against the world, whom the Lord will destroy with the breath of his mouth and the blowing of his wrath (cf. Job 4:9; Isaiah 11:4; 2 Thessalonians. 2:8).

4b. You have also heard of the honour of the Cross and its appearance and the conversion of the gentiles to the true knowledge of Christ, how the important Jew Castor believed with his entire house and became an elected Christian and (how) it was my humbleness (ταμῆτελαχιστος) that baptized him as he loved the faith in the Son of God.

5. And I also baptized a great number of Samaritans, one of them being Isaac of Joppe, who was also of this kind: he became an elected Christian within the Church of Christ.

I say these things to you because we have already earlier taught your charity<sup>61</sup> from them. But the words of Christ never grow old, they are sweeter than honey and a honeycomb, as the blessed David has said: 'Your words were sweeter in my throat than honey in my mouth (Psalm 119 [LXX 118]:103).'

6. Let us now, however, remember the great debt we have and see whether we will be able to repay a little of it, even if we are unable to repay it entirely because of our poverty. (...) It is Jesus, the true light, who has invited us to this

<sup>58</sup> Tito Orlandi was the first to draw attention to this passage, in his 'Cyrillo di Gerusalemme,' 95 (with Latin translation); also Antonella Campagano, *Omélie copte*, 10–11 and 154–157 (text with Italian translation).

<sup>59</sup> *On the Virgin Mary*, 3–5; ed. Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 154–156.

<sup>60</sup> I have divided § 4 into two parts to facilitate references.

<sup>61</sup> For this expression, see p. 179, n. 186 below.

holy day, to the commemoration of her who became for him a temple and a throne and a resting-place. And as he has invited us, we cannot be negligent to fulfil what we have promised in the beginning of this catechesis. This is the day of the pure woman and the holy prophetess. This is the day on which the Queen, the mother of the King, tasted death, like every human being; she was also born from a father and a mother, like every human being.

There is little doubt that the person who composed this passage was aware of the existence of a homily *On the Holy Cross* that was ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem (§ 4b), but did he really know it? The passage raises some pertinent questions, which will be addressed below.

1. In §§ 3 and 4a, the author claims that he has preached about all the main facts of Christ's life: his baptism by John and the coming down of the Spirit, his passion, death and resurrection, and his ascension to heaven, his sitting at the right hand of the Father, his coming for the final judgement (the last events in terms that are strongly reminiscent of the Creed), and, finally, the eschatological woes caused by the devil, who, however, will be destroyed. The question here is whether we have to take this enumeration at face value and thus assume that there once existed a whole range of homilies, a 'Cyrillian Cycle,' about Christ and the fundamental Christian beliefs, of which most are lost and only a few homilies about the Passion and the Resurrection have survived.<sup>62</sup> It should be observed, however, that every priest who had to preach regularly to a Christian community would have frequently addressed all of these subjects in the course of his career. The author of *On the Virgin Mary* was not far of the mark when he claimed that Cyril of Jerusalem had preached about the great facts of Christ's life and Christian doctrine. The fact that a number of homilies on the Passion and the Resurrection were attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, need not imply that written sermons on the other subjects circulated under Cyril's name. As a matter of fact, Pseudo-Cyril only says that he has preached about the topics mentioned in §§ 3 and 4a, not that he has published these sermons.

---

<sup>62</sup> This is the view of Orlandi, 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme,' 96: 'possiamo pensare che altre siano andate perdute,' and Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 13: 'delle altre omelie non risulta la minima traccia.' On the basis of *On the Virgin Mary*, 3–5, Orlandi has rather unconvincingly tried to explain why the superscription of that homily says that it is Cyril of Jerusalem's '21st exegesis': the 'cycle' would have contained eighteen of Cyril's authentic *Catechetical Lectures* (without the *Procatechesis* and the five *Mystagogical Catecheses*), followed by various homilies on 'Jesus, the Holy Spirit and the Antichrist' (No. 19), *On the Holy Cross* (No. 20) and *On the Virgin Mary* (No. 21).

The whole passage could have been written without any knowledge of existing Cyrillian homilies on these subjects.

2. It is hardly conceivable, however, that this also holds for the reference to a homily on the appearance of the Cross (§ 4b), the more so as the figure of the Samaritan Isaac of Joppe appears in this context (§ 5). It seems reasonable to assume that the author here refers to the existing homily *On the Holy Cross*, in which the story of Isaac the Samaritan plays such an important part. This nevertheless presents us with some serious problems here. The first is that it is not Isaac but the Jew Castor who is directly connected with the story of the Cross. Isaac is only mentioned as one of the many Samaritans Cyril claims to have baptized. In the homily on the Cross, however, the Jew Castor does not occur at all. As we have seen above, the baptism of Castor is only explicitly mentioned in the superscription of the homily *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, and presupposed in the text itself. But the superscription has little or nothing to do with the ensuing text and the passage on Castor does not explicitly speak about his baptism and looks like a later insertion, probably based on the superscription.<sup>63</sup> The superscription seems originally to have belonged to a Pseudo-Cyrillian homily on the discovery of the Cross, but the contents of this homily remain unknown. It may have been a variant of our *Homily on the Holy Cross*, in which the story of Isaac the Samaritan had been replaced by that of Castor the Jew.<sup>64</sup> However this may be, it seems certain that the author who wrote §§ 4b and 5 of the *Homily on the Virgin Mary* quoted above, was familiar with a story on the rediscovered Cross and the conversion of Castor the Jew and his baptism by Cyril. He also knew a story about the conversion and baptism of Isaac the Samaritan, also by Cyril, but it remains unclear whether this story was also connected with the cult of the Cross. The conclusion can only be that the author of the *Homily on the Virgin Mary* was aware of a homily on the Cross that was attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, but also that we cannot be sure that this homily was identical with the surviving homily *On the Holy Cross*. If the author was indeed familiar with the latter homily, it must have been written before or in the first half of the sixth century, as the homily *On the Virgin Mary* most probably has to be dated to that period.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>63</sup> See pp. 77, 78 and 79. The possibility of a later insertion was also considered by Campanano, *Omélies coptes*, 12.

<sup>64</sup> The name of this otherwise unknown person may have been borrowed from Flavius Josephus, *De bello Judaico* V, 7, 4 (§§ 317–330).

<sup>65</sup> See pp. 96–97.



3. The homilies *On the Holy Cross*, *On the Virgin Mary*, and *On the Passion and the Resurrection* have some peculiar features in common, which might be an indication that they originated in the same milieu. The most conspicuous of these common features is the appeal on Irenaeus and Josephus or Philo as witnesses to the truth of what the author is saying. Irenaeus is described as a Jewish author, who wrote an *Ancient History* like Josephus. Moreover, Cyril, too, is repeatedly presented in the same context as a Jew who had converted to Christianity. A quick look at the evidence may suffice. In the homily *On the Virgin Mary*, the author invokes the testimony of the genealogies (§§ 8 and 12) of Irenaeus and Josephus about Mary's tribe and the names of her ancestors. According to § 12 these are to be found in the *Ancient Histories* (ἱστοριαι [sic]) of these authors, 'who are from the Hebrews, like me.' The same title (ἱστοριαι) is mentioned in § 39: Josephus and Irenaeus, 'who are from the Hebrews,' are said to have reported in their *Ancient Histories* that at the time of Mary's death John and Mary lived in the same house in Jerusalem. In the homily *On the Cross*, the *Ancient Histories* of Josephus and Irenaeus, 'who are from the Hebrews,' are said to have declared that 'there was a great wickedness in the heart of the Jews who crucified their Lord on the wood of the Cross, so that they wanted to hide it' (§ 49); in § 68, the same authors, 'who are from the Hebrews,' are referred to as sources for the episode of the concealment of the Cross. According to § 60 of the same homily, Irenaeus and (Ms. E adds: the historiographer) Philo testify that it took seventy-three years for the Jews to cover the tomb of Jesus with rubbish. Finally, the homily *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 20, quotes from a homily (λογος) which Irenaeus 'the historiographer' delivered 'as he commented on the bitterness of the unleavened bread (εὐχερμηνεύε ἡπίσθεν ἡ ἀθάβ).'<sup>66</sup> The quotation reads: 'As the Logos of God, who has suffered for us, Christ, was stretched out upon the cross, his tongue was cut by thirst and his lips were withered by the intensity of the burning and scorched by the heat of the sun. And he asked for water, but the senseless and lawless Jews brought him vinegar mixed with gall.'<sup>67</sup> Pseudo-Cyril's reference to a specific exegesis of the institution of the Pesach meal (as referring to the death of Christ) and the form of the quotation itself makes it conceivable that we are

<sup>66</sup> Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 37, interprets the word ἀθάβ as a proper name: 'l'aceto di Athab,' but it seems more probable that the Coptic word for 'without leaven, unleavened' is meant (cf. Crum, *Dictionary*, 457b, s.v. ὀαβ). According to Exodus 12:8, the paschal lamb should be eaten with unleavened bread and a bitter sauce (ἄζυμα ἐπὶ πικρίδων ἔδονται; also Numbers 9:12: ἐπ' ἄζυμων καὶ πικρίδων φάγονται αὐτό).

<sup>67</sup> Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 36–38.

here concerned with the citation of an existing text, which was somehow attributed to Irenaeus.<sup>68</sup> But, however that may be, the uncommon description of Irenaeus as a ‘historiographer’ points to the same background as the Cyrillian texts mentioned above. This impression is supported by another specific ‘Cyrillian’ tradition in the homily *On the Passion and the Resurrection*: the idea that Cyril was of Jewish descent (see above *On the Virgin Mary*, 12) and was himself a convert to Christianity. In § 28, speaking about the meaning of ‘Eloi, Eloi’ and its misinterpretation by some of the bystanders (Mark 15:34–35), the author says that it means: “My God, my God” according to the Hebrew language, as I have believed in them myself,—me, to whom the grace has occurred’ (ἡμεῖς ζω ἡταπιστευε ἡζητοῦ ἀνοκ πενταπεζμοτ ταροϋ). The same expression recurs in § 40, as Cyril exhorts the converted Jew Castor to recognize ‘the grace which has occurred to you, as it has occurred to myself (τεχαρις ἡτασταροκ ἡμε ἡτασταροι ζω).’<sup>69</sup>

The homilies *On the Cross*, *On the Virgin Mary* and *On the Passion and the Resurrection* share some specific, very uncommon ideas and expressions. Since the homily *On the Resurrection* is almost certainly a sequel to *On the Passion and the Resurrection*,<sup>70</sup> it probably has to be assigned to these related works also, although it does not show any of the peculiar features mentioned above.<sup>71</sup> The question which remains is how to explain these interconnections. *On the Virgin Mary* and *On the Cross* have so much in

<sup>68</sup> The point that Pseudo-Cyril wants to make is that the mixture that was Jesus given to drink was meant to torture him. The Gospels only speak of vinegar, the gall comes from Psalm 69:22; the combination of both is already found in the first half of the second century (see for instance the *Letter of Barnabas* 7, 3: σταυρωθεὶς ἐποτίζετο ὄξει καὶ χολῇ). As a matter of fact, Irenaeus is also a representative of this tradition, as witnessed by his *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, 82: ‘And at his crucifixion, when he asked a drink, they gave him to drink vinegar mixed with gall’ (translation by A. Robinson, *St. Irenaeus. The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, Translated from the Armenian with Introduction and Notes*, London / New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge / The MacMillan Co., 1920, 138); also in *Adversus Haereses*, III, 19, 2 and IV, 33, 12. For the traditions on what Jesus was given to drink, see W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1909 (reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), 217–220.

<sup>69</sup> See p. 78.

<sup>70</sup> See p. 80.

<sup>71</sup> Orlandi, ‘Cyril of Jerusalem,’ in *Coptic Encyclopedia*, 3 (1991) 681–682, and Campagnano, *Omēlie copte*, 11–13, also concluded that there was a close interconnection between these four homilies. Campagnano also pointed to the refutation of the idea of Mary as a heavenly force in *On the Virgin Mary* and *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, but this argument is invalid, because this refutation is also found in other Coptic homilies, which are not attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem; see p. 97 above.

common that they must have been produced in the same specific spiritual milieu. If the prologue of *On the Virgin Mary* really referred to the still extant homily *On the Holy Cross*, the latter must have been written before the former, which—as we saw above—has to be dated to the first half of the sixth century.<sup>72</sup> The sermon *On the Passion and the Resurrection* contains a distinct set of ideas that are more clearly exposed in the homilies *On the Holy Cross* and *On the Virgin Mary*, though it could have been written at a later date, which also holds for its sequel, *On the Resurrection*. That a later date, notwithstanding a distinct interconnection, cannot be excluded is clearly shown by the homily *On the Life and the Passsion of Christ* (M610), which borrows the figure of Bachius from *On the Holy Cross*, but was most probably composed in the first half of the ninth century. All this leads to the conclusion that the theory of a whole cycle of homilies attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, which was produced by a homogenous literary school, is built on rather shaky grounds.

---

<sup>72</sup> See pp. 96–97. Campagnano, *Omélies coptes*, 18, dated the Coptic Cyrillian ‘Cycle’ to the first half of the seventh century. According to Orlandi, ‘Cycle,’ in *Coptic Encyclopedia*, 3 (1991), 668, the Coptic homiletic cycles originated in the period after Pope Damian (569–605): ‘We can therefore designate an interval from the mid-seventh century to the mid-eighth century as the most logical time for the composition of the cycles.’

PSEUDO-CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

*ON THE LIFE AND THE PASSION OF CHRIST*



## SIGLA AND EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

- M     Ms. M610 of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.  
P     Ms. E 16262 of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania.  
[...]   square brackets indicate a lacuna in the manuscript.  
⟨...⟩   pointed brackets indicate an editorial correction of a scribal mistake.  
(...)   round brackets in the translation indicate clarifying additions by the translator.  
ḏ     a dot under a letter indicates that the letter is visually uncertain.  
ṅ     the superlinear stroke is placed above all consonants with a syllabic function.

Punctuation marks: only the full stop is used to mark the end of a sentence.

The text has been divided into 162 sections in order to facilitate references.

1a οὐ ἐξηκηνσὶς ἐαφταγὸς ἥβι πῆλαγιος ἀπα κύριλλος παρχνεπισκοπος ἡθῖλῃν ἡπναγ  
 ἡωωρεπ ἡπερτοοῦ ἡπνοῦ ἡπασχα. ἡταφταγὸς δε εἰρεμ про ἡπεῶσιαστηριον  
 εἰ πτρεπλαος παρακαλει ἡμοφ δε ματσαν εβολ εἰ τπγτη ἡπεκμοῦ. ἡτοφ  
 δε αφαρχει εἰσγνταγμα ἡἡαποστολος ἐαφταγε οὔμνηνε ἡεἡτοῦ. αἰω αἰερ  
 ωπηρε ἡτεφΔιδασκαλια ετρολῶ παρα πεβω αφαρχει εἰεἰσε ἡταπενσωτηρ  
 ωποοῦ εἰρον ετεναῖ ἡε. εἰ οὔειρνην ἡτεπμοῦτε. εἰμνη.

1b 1. | ἀπεβοτ παρμοῦτε εἰ ναν εφο ἡαγει αἰαν ἡε ἡἡσιοῦ ἡπεστερεωма αἰω  
 ἡε ἡνεσ(ο)οῦ<sup>a</sup> ἡιακωβ ππατριαρχης ἡπεοῦοειω ἡταφσῃ πεφбекн мῃ λαβαν.  
 αἰω он εφине ἡτεωτηн ἡωснф ἡβι πεβοτ ἡβῖре ἡἡεβραιος ετε παῖ πε παρ-  
 μοῦτε πεβοτ ἡἡ-foῦω ἡἡωнн. 2. ἀπεβοτ παρμοῦτε εἰνε εтннте εἰ τεφαρхи  
 ἡοῦноῦ ἡωωне εφεпн εἰн тпаравасис ἡεγза. ἡπερωне εωωγονεῖ εβολ ἡπει-

<sup>a</sup>М ἡνεσioῦ, with ι deleted. Originally: ἡνε(сooῦ ἡсoῦ)cioῦ, ‘speckled sheep’?

A homily<sup>1</sup> which the holy Apa Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, delivered in the early morning of the fourth day of the Great Pascha.<sup>2</sup> He delivered it at the door of the sanctuary,<sup>3</sup> as the people beseeched him: 'Give us to drink from the well of your blessing.' He, then, began with the writings of the apostles<sup>4</sup> and related a good deal of their contents. And they marvelled at his teaching, which was sweeter than honey. He started with the sufferings our Saviour endured for us, which are as follows. In the peace of God. Amen

1. The month of Parmoute has come, many-coloured<sup>5</sup> like the stars of the firmament and like the sheep of Jacob the Patriarch at the time he made an agreement about his wage with Laban.<sup>6</sup> And the New Month of the Hebrews, which is Parmoute, the month of the sprouting of the trees,<sup>7</sup> is also like the garment of Joseph.<sup>8</sup> 2. At its beginning,<sup>9</sup> the month of Parmoute brought forward a great disease which had been hidden since the transgression of

---

<sup>1</sup> In §§ 160 and 161, the author himself calls his work a religious instruction (καθηγησις). In Coptic homiletic literature, the words καταγησις, ἐκκησις and λόγος became almost synonymous and simply meant 'homily.' See Depuydt, *Catalogue*, XCII; in later Byzantine Greek the verb ἐξηγέομαι could mean 'to preach' (Lampe, *Lexicon*, 496a s.v. B).

<sup>2</sup> For this term, see pp. 2–3 above. In § 93 the author speaks of 'the Great Week of the Pascha,' which was the usual Greek and Coptic name of Holy Week; cf. Lampe, *Lexicon*, 396a s.v. ἑβδομάς B.3.

<sup>3</sup> In Coptic, as in Greek (Lampe, *Lexicon*, 660, s.v.), θυσιαστήριον means both 'altar' and 'altar precinct, sanctuary,' the former being far more current than the latter. For examples of the meaning 'altar precinct,' see De Vis, *Homélies coptes*, I, 79, 5; II, 155, 8; 260, 3; Crum, *Papyruscodex*, 14 ([46] text), 68 (transl.), and Worrell, *The Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, 178 (text), 340 (transl.), where mention is made of a man who lays his hand on the doors of the sanctuary (ἐχὼν ἥρο ἡπεθγισακτηριον) and swears an oath.

<sup>4</sup> See pp. 9–13.

<sup>5</sup> In the Coptic Bible ἀγχι ἀγαν (= Greek ποικίλος) is used of both Jacob's sheep and Joseph's garment (see the texts mentioned in notes 6 and 8).

<sup>6</sup> Genesis 30:28–43 and 31:12.

<sup>7</sup> See also Pseudo-Evodius of Rome, *On the Passion and the Resurrection of the Lord*, ed. P. Chapman, in Depuydt, *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, 82: 'The Jews completed their transgression on the 14th of the month called April according to the Romans, Parmoute according to the Egyptians. This is the New Month, in which all the trees sprout and live again and indicate the resurrection of the entire creation.' The same idea in Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *Homily 4, On the Resurrection and the Passion*, Morgan Cod. 595, 4a, 17–30 (Facs. ed. 43, 6a; cf. Depuydt, *Catalogue*, 345 f. [No. 170, 1] and p. 83 above). For the identification of Coptic Parmoute with Roman April and Jewish Nisan, the New Month, see p. 42.

<sup>8</sup> Genesis 37:3 and 23.

<sup>9</sup> According to many Jewish and Christian sources, the fall of Adam and Eve took place on the day of their creation, which was the sixth day of the month Nisan/Parmoute; cf. Ginzburg, *Legends of the Jews*, vol. V, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1925 (7th impr. 1955), 106–107.



- 2a    νοϑ̅ ἡ̅χρονοϑ̅ | εἰ̅μη̅τι̅ ιο̅υ̅δα̅ϑ̅ π̅ει̅μαι̅ρο̅μη̅τ̅ ἡ̅φ̅ω̅νε̅υ̅ϑ̅. α̅ω̅ π̅ε̅ π̅ω̅ω̅νε̅ ε̅τ̅ρ̅η̅π̅  
 ρ̅α̅θ̅η̅ ἡ̅νε̅ι̅νοϑ̅ ἡ̅χρονοϑ̅ εἰ̅μη̅τε̅ι̅ π̅ω̅ω̅νε̅ ἡ̅τ̅α̅ε̅υ̅ρ̅α̅ ω̅ω̅νε̅ ἡ̅ρ̅η̅τ̅ῷ̅ ἡ̅π̅η̅α̅υ̅ ἡ̅τ̅α̅ϑ̅-  
 π̅ι̅θ̅υ̅μ̅ε̅ι̅ ε̅π̅ω̅η̅η̅ α̅ϑ̅ϑ̅ο̅υ̅τ̅ῷ̅ ε̅β̅ο̅λ̅ ἡ̅τ̅ε̅ϑ̅ϑ̅ι̅χ̅ α̅ϑ̅ο̅υ̅ω̅η̅ ε̅β̅ο̅λ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ π̅ω̅η̅η̅ ἡ̅π̅α̅ρ̅α̅δ̅ι̅-  
 ϑ̅οϑ̅ ἡ̅τ̅ε̅τ̅ρ̅υ̅φ̅η̅. 3. α̅ι̅ο̅υ̅δ̅α̅ϑ̅ ρ̅ω̅ω̅υ̅ ϑ̅ο̅ο̅υ̅τ̅ῷ̅ ε̅β̅ο̅λ̅ ἡ̅νε̅υ̅ϑ̅ι̅χ̅ ἡ̅ω̅ρ̅ο̅υ̅ω̅α̅α̅τ̅ο̅υ̅ α̅υ̅χ̅ι̅  
 ἡ̅τ̅τ̅ι̅μ̅η̅ ἡ̅π̅χ̅ο̅ε̅ιϑ̅ ἡ̅η̅α̅τ̅π̅ε̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅α̅π̅κ̅α̅ρ̅ α̅υ̅τ̅α̅α̅υ̅ ε̅τ̅ο̅ο̅τ̅ο̅υ̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ο̅υ̅γ̅α̅ι̅ ἡ̅α̅γ̅η̅ω̅ω̅η̅
- 2b    α̅γ̅η̅ο̅ο̅υ̅τ̅ῷ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ π̅ε̅β̅ο̅τ̅ π̅α̅ρ̅η̅ο̅υ̅τ̅ε̅. 4. | α̅γ̅η̅ο̅ο̅υ̅[τ̅ῷ̅ ε̅ρ̅]ε̅ θ̅[ῡ̅μ̅ε̅ρ̅α̅ ἡ̅π̅ο̅]ο̅ρ̅<sup>a</sup> ω̅η̅ω̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅  
 θ̅γ̅η̅ε̅ρ̅α̅ ἡ̅π̅ε̅β̅ο̅τ̅ ἡ̅θ̅ε̅ ἡ̅τ̅α̅η̅ρ̅ε̅ ε̅ρ̅ο̅ο̅υ̅ ε̅υ̅χ̅η̅ρ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ϑ̅ῡ̅η̅τ̅α̅γ̅ῃ̅α̅ ἡ̅η̅ε̅ν̅ε̅ι̅ο̅τ̅ε̅ ἡ̅α̅π̅ο̅ϑ̅τ̅ο̅λ̅οϑ̅  
 ε̅τ̅ο̅γ̅α̅α̅β̅ ἡ̅α̅ι̅ ἡ̅τ̅α̅υ̅ρ̅α̅ι̅τ̅ο̅υ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ τ̅ε̅ι̅ρ̅α̅γ̅ι̅α̅ ἡ̅π̅ο̅λ̅ιϑ̅ θ̅ι̅λ̅ῃ̅ῃ̅.
5. ϑ̅ω̅τ̅ῃ̅ ε̅ρ̅ο̅ι̅ ω̅ ἡ̅α̅ω̅η̅ρ̅ε̅ ε̅τ̅τ̅α̅ε̅ι̅η̅υ̅ τ̅α̅χ̅ω̅ ε̅ρ̅ω̅τ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ρ̅ῃ̅κ̅ο̅γ̅ι̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ε̅η̅τ̅α̅η̅ρ̅ε̅<sup>b</sup> ε̅ρ̅ο̅ο̅υ̅  
 ε̅υ̅χ̅η̅ρ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ π̅η̅ι̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅α̅ρ̅ι̅α̅ τ̅ῃ̅α̅α̅υ̅ ἡ̅ι̅ω̅ρ̅α̅η̅η̅η̅ϑ̅ π̅ε̅τ̅ο̅γ̅ῃ̅ο̅υ̅τ̅ε̅ ε̅ρ̅ο̅υ̅ χ̅ε̅ ἡ̅α̅ρ̅κ̅οϑ̅ ε̅β̅ο̅λ̅  
 (χ̅ε̅)<sup>c</sup> ρ̅ῃ̅ π̅ε̅ο̅γ̅ο̅ε̅ι̅ω̅ ε̅τ̅ῃ̅α̅υ̅ ἡ̅π̅ο̅υ̅κ̅ω̅τ̅ ἡ̅π̅ῃ̅α̅ ε̅τ̅ῃ̅α̅υ̅ ἡ̅ε̅κ̅κ̅λ̅η̅ϑ̅ι̅α̅ α̅λ̅λ̅α̅ ε̅ϑ̅ο̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅α̅
- 3a    ἡ̅β̅ο̅ι̅λ̅ε̅ ἡ̅η̅ε̅α̅π̅οϑ̅|τ̅ο̅λ̅οϑ̅ ε̅τ̅β̅ε̅ θ̅ο̅τ̅ε̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ο̅υ̅γ̅α̅ι̅ κ̅α̅τ̅α̅ θ̅ε̅ ο̅η̅ ε̅τ̅χ̅η̅ρ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ε̅π̅ρ̅α̅ζ̅ιϑ̅<sup>d</sup>  
 ἡ̅ῃ̅α̅π̅ο̅ϑ̅τ̅ο̅λ̅οϑ̅. 6. α̅γ̅ω̅ ἡ̅ε̅υ̅ρ̅ῃ̅π̅ε̅ π̅ε̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ τ̅κ̅ε̅μ̅α̅ρ̅ι̅α̅ ω̅α̅η̅τ̅ε̅τ̅π̅ε̅η̅τ̅η̅κ̅οϑ̅τ̅ῃ̅ τ̅ῃ̅ρ̅(ῑ̅)<sup>e</sup>  
 ο̅υ̅γ̅ε̅ι̅η̅ε̅ ἡ̅τ̅ε̅π̅ε̅π̅ῃ̅α̅ ε̅τ̅ο̅γ̅α̅α̅β̅ εἰ̅ ε̅ρ̅ρ̅α̅ι̅ ε̅χ̅ω̅ο̅υ̅ ἡ̅ϑ̅ε̅β̅ω̅κ̅ ε̅β̅ο̅λ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ε̅χ̅ω̅ρ̅α̅ ἡ̅ϑ̅ε̅τ̅α̅ω̅ε̅  
 ο̅ε̅ι̅ω̅ ἡ̅τ̅α̅η̅α̅ϑ̅τ̅α̅ϑ̅ιϑ̅ ἡ̅π̅ω̅η̅ῃ̅. α̅υ̅ρ̅ῡ̅η̅ζ̅ῃ̅τ̅ε̅ι̅<sup>f</sup> ἡ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ε̅υ̅ε̅ρ̅ῃ̅η̅ α̅υ̅ρ̅α̅ι̅ ἡ̅η̅ε̅ρ̅β̅ῃ̅η̅ε̅ τ̅ῃ̅ρ̅ο̅υ̅  
 ἡ̅τ̅α̅υ̅ω̅ω̅π̅ε̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ε̅ρ̅ι̅ϑ̅ε̅ ἡ̅τ̅α̅υ̅ω̅ρ̅ο̅υ̅ ἡ̅β̅ο̅ι̅ π̅ε̅η̅ϑ̅ω̅τ̅ῃ̅ρ̅ α̅γ̅ω̅ π̅ε̅η̅ω̅ῃ̅ῃ̅ ω̅α̅η̅τ̅ε̅υ̅τ̅ω̅ο̅υ̅η̅  
 ε̅β̅ο̅λ̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅ε̅τ̅ῃ̅ο̅ο̅υ̅τ̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ϑ̅ω̅τ̅ε̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ο̅η̅.
- 3b    7. | λ̅ο̅ι̅π̅ο̅η̅ α̅θ̅ε̅ω̅α̅ω̅ϑ̅ι̅οϑ̅ π̅λ̅α̅ι̅α̅κ̅ο̅η̅οϑ̅ ω̅ῃ̅η̅ε̅ ρ̅ῃ̅ ἡ̅χ̅ω̅ω̅η̅ε̅ ἡ̅ε̅η̅ϑ̅ῡ̅η̅τ̅α̅γ̅ῃ̅α̅ ἡ̅η̅ε̅ν̅ε̅ι̅-  
 ο̅τ̅ε̅ ἡ̅α̅π̅ο̅ϑ̅τ̅ο̅λ̅οϑ̅. α̅υ̅β̅ῃ̅η̅ε̅<sup>g</sup> ἡ̅ο̅γ̅κ̅ο̅γ̅ι̅ ἡ̅χ̅ω̅ω̅η̅ε̅ ἡ̅ῃ̅ε̅β̅ρ̅α̅η̅ο̅η̅ ἡ̅ο̅γ̅ιϑ̅ ε̅ϑ̅ῃ̅α̅ε̅ρ̅ ο̅υ̅ρ̅ῡ̅τ̅ω̅

<sup>a</sup>For the reconstruction, see § 82. The text was originally also found in P fol. 3<sup>ro</sup> col a, but it has become illegible. <sup>b</sup>P fol. 3<sup>ro</sup> col. b begins at this point, but the text is only partly legible. <sup>c</sup>M om. χε; P lacuna. <sup>d</sup>P fol. 3<sup>vo</sup> col. a begins at this point. <sup>e</sup>M τῃρῷ; F lacuna.

<sup>f</sup>P λοιπον [αυ]ρῃηζῃτῃε. <sup>g</sup>P fol. 3<sup>vo</sup> col. b breaks off at this point.

Eve. During this long time, nobody was able to reveal it, except for Judas, this money-loving murderer. What else is the disease that had been hidden for these long times but the disease from which Eve was suffering as she desired the tree, stretched out her hand and ate from the tree of the paradise of delight?<sup>10</sup> 3. Judas also stretched out his hands, which were worthy to be cut off; he received the price of the Lord of everything which is in heaven and on earth; he delivered him into the hands of the senseless Jews, and they killed him in the month of Parmoute. 4. They killed [him when the day of the mo]n coincided with the day of the month,<sup>11</sup> like we found written in the writings of our fathers, the holy apostles, which they wrote in this holy city of Jerusalem.<sup>12</sup>

5. Listen to me, oh my honoured children, and let me tell you something of what we found written in the house of Mary, the mother of John, who is called Mark.<sup>13</sup> For in that time they had not yet built that place into a church,<sup>14</sup> but it was a dwelling place of the apostles because of the fear of the Jews, as is also written in the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>15</sup> 6. And they were hidden, together with Mary,<sup>16</sup> until the whole Pentecost had passed by and the Holy Spirit came down upon them and they went through the countries and preached the resurrection of life. They deliberated with each other and wrote down all the things that had happened and the sufferings which our Saviour and our Life had endured until he rose from the dead and redeemed us.

7. Theodosius the deacon, then, sought among the books for the writings of our fathers, the apostles. He found a small book of parchment which

<sup>10</sup> Genesis 3:6; cf. Genesis 3:23 and 24 (LXX): τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς.

<sup>11</sup> See p. 42 and § 82.

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 9–11 above.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Acts 12:12.

<sup>14</sup> The reference is to the church on Mount Sion, built in the 4th century and called 'the superior church of the Apostles' (ἡ ἀνώτερα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐκκλησία) by Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.*, 16, 4 (PG 33, 924A). See J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land. Newly translated with supporting documents and notes*, rev. ed., Jerusalem / Warminster: Ariel Publishing House / Aris & Phillips 1981, 38–39.

<sup>15</sup> In Acts 12:1–9 it is suggested, though not explicitly stated, that the house of Mary served as a hiding place for the apostles. The fear of the Jews is mentioned in John 20:19. Cf. also Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Holy Cross*, 50 (ed. Campagnano, *Omilie Copte*, 108/9): 'The disciples were hidden because of the fear of the Jews.' In the Coptic homily *On the Dormition of the Virgin*, attributed to Evodius of Rome, the same is said in connection with the death of the Virgin Mary (ed. S.J. Shoemaker, 'The Sahidic Coptic Homily on the Dormition of the Virgin Attributed to Evodius of Rome,' *AB* 117 [1999] 270/271, § 15).

<sup>16</sup> *μή τε καὶ αὐτὴ* here does not mean 'and the other Mary' but 'and also Mary,' i.e. the Mother of Jesus, cf. §§ 59, 76, 87.

εφσнз н̄сγнιων τηρῆ. ереñтωω н̄пех̄с мñ нентαγωωπε н̄μοq мñ н̄αποστολος  
 мñ ѳе н̄ταιογΔας ωωπε н̄προΔολнс аq† н̄пех̄с за зат. 8. αѳεωΔωсiос παιδ-  
 конос εινε н̄пхωωме аqеi ωароi анок кγrλλос εiωооп зñ пепископион анок  
 4a | мñ оγпресвγтерос н̄маиноγτε епечран пе вαхос пaи н̄ταιιxиpоΔoneи н̄моq  
 н̄епископос зñ πογεзсаzne н̄ппоγτε мñ пeγγφисма н̄πλαос τηρῆ. н̄τερixи оγн  
 н̄пхωωме аiωω зiωωq н̄зñкoγi. апа вαχιос Δе ne оγсаz пе зñ псiмiон аi†  
 наq н̄пхωωме. аγω н̄тереqωω зiωωq аqze ероq εφснз н̄теize Δе:

9. пaи пе птωzñ н̄ic пех̄с н̄таqтωzñ н̄знтῆ. зñ оγειрннн. замнн. 10. птωzñ  
 4b Δе н̄н̄αποστολος neγeteize пе<sup>a</sup> | εβολ зiтñ ппоγте. сiмωн петрос мñ ιωzανннс  
 мñ аηΔρεас мñ ιακωβос ne зñоγωze ne н̄ρεqсеп тῆт каτa ттexнн н̄пeикос-  
 мос. пзλλо н̄φιλιппос оγρεqΔωpñ пе зñ пагωн. ѳωмас зωωq оγκεκλεγтнс  
 пе. вαρεθoλomaиос оγкoмaριтнс нса н̄оγoote пе. ѳαΔΔaиос оγρεqкезкωz ωne  
 пе. μαтῳaиос оγτελωннс пе. сiмωн пκαnанитнс оγρεqтωzñ пе епna н̄ωελεет.  
 5a ιακωβос пωнpe н̄αλφaиос оγκεκλεγтнс пе. | ιογΔας пскаριωтнс аqῖ ωñмo  
 етнн̄тапостoлос.

11. аγω етве птωω н̄маѳias н̄поγсotπῆ н̄пnaγ н̄таγсmиne н̄псγннтаγμα  
 оγΔе παγλος оγΔе μαρκос аλλα мñнса етpeγxи н̄пернт н̄пeиωт ете пπαpa-  
 κληтос н̄пñΔ пе.

12. naи нентансентoγ зñ н̄сγннтаγμα н̄танωpῖпωaΔe еpooy. асωωпе Δе  
 н̄тереπeнсωтнр пeнxoeис аγω пeнωнῆ τηρñ xи вaπтicма зñ пopΔaннс зiтñ  
 ιωzανннс н̄coγнн̄тoγe н̄пeвot ε(ιaнoγaριос)<sup>b</sup> ете тωве пе (αqχιтῆ)<sup>c</sup> зωс  
 5b pωme | εγнoγte пе кγrиос зñ оγxωк н̄тpиaΔикoн зñ оγнн̄тoγa.

<sup>a</sup>Cf. Matthew 1:18: neγeteize пе = οὕτως ἦν.

<sup>c</sup>M omits the verb of the main clause.

<sup>b</sup>M ειογλιανος; see note to translation.

may hardly have measured a span, entirely written in shorthand. It contained the commandments of Christ<sup>17</sup> and what happened to him and the apostles, and the way Judas became a traitor and delivered Jesus up for money. 8. Theodosius the deacon brought the book and came to me, Cyril, when I was in the episcopal palace, I and a God-loving priest whose name was Bachius,<sup>18</sup> whom I have ordained bishop by the command of God and the vote of the whole people. As I, then, received the book I read a little in it. Apa Bachius, however, was a master in shorthand, and I gave him the book. And as he read it, he found it written as follows:

9. 'This is the calling of Jesus Christ with which he has called (the apostles). In peace. Amen. 10. The calling, then, of the apostles was in this way by God.<sup>19</sup> Simon Peter, John, Andrew and James<sup>20</sup> were fishers, fish catchers according to the craft of this world. The father<sup>21</sup> of Philip was a charioteer in the races. Thomas, however, was a tender of the waterwheel. Bartholomew was a gardener, a grower and seller of greens. Thaddeus was a stonecutter. Matthew was a tax collector. Simon Cananites was an inviter to the wedding. James the son of Alpheus was a tender of the waterwheel. Judas Iscariot has been estranged from the apostleship.'

11. And concerning the appointment of Matthias, they had not yet chosen him when they composed this writing, nor Paul, nor Mark, but (they did so) after they had received the promise of the Father,<sup>22</sup> which is the Paraclete, the Spirit.

12. These are the facts as we found them in the writings of which we have spoken before. 'It happened, then, when our Saviour, our Lord and the Life of all of us was baptized by John in the river Jordan, on the eleventh day of the month of January,<sup>23</sup> which is Tobe, (he was baptized) as a man, whereas he was actually God in a triune perfection.'<sup>24</sup>

<sup>17</sup> This probably refers to the calling of the apostles in §§ 13–15.

<sup>18</sup> For the priest Bachios (the Ms. reads here Bachos), see pp. 77 and 99.

<sup>19</sup> For the following, see pp. 14–33.

<sup>20</sup> The separation of the names of the brothers Peter and Andrew is also found in Mark 3:16–18; 13:3 and Acts 1:13.

<sup>21</sup> Lit.: 'the old man.'

<sup>22</sup> The expression 'the promise of the Father' is found in Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:4. In Acts 1:16, Matthias is chosen *before* the coming down of the Spirit.

<sup>23</sup> The month of Tobe began on December 27 and ended on January 25, which implies that the reading of the Ms., ειογλιανος, must be a scribal error for ειανογαριος.

<sup>24</sup> The Coptic word εωκ corresponds to Greek πλήρωμα, which was used to describe the divine perfection of the Trinity, which in itself was regarded as a unity; see the texts mentioned by Lampe, *Lexicon*, 1095a s.v. πλήρωμα B.3; 478a s.v. ἐνότης 4.a and 487a s.v. ἔνωσις B. I take κγριος to be a Coptic form of the Greek adverb κυρίως; cf. § 79, where, in a similar context, the word κγριος is also used.

13. αὐτὸ μὴνῆσα ἐτρεφεί βαπτίσμα αὐεῖ ἐκπαράγε αὐναὺ ἐροὶ ἀνοκ πέτρος  
 μὴ ἀνδρεᾶς πασον. ἀφμοοῦε ἐρον πεχὰν ναν ἔε οὐεῖτηγῆτῆ ἥσῳι ταῖτηγῆτῆ  
 ἡοῦωε ἥρωμε. ἀνον ἔε ἀνμοῦε ἥρωε ἀνογὰρῆ ἥσῳι ἀνοκ μὴ ἀνδρεᾶς αὐτὸ  
 ἡπενκοτῆ ὡα νενμεράτε ἔιν ἡπειναὺ αὐτὸ ἡῖοῦηε ἥσῳι τηρεν.

6a 14. ἡτερενμοοῦε ἔε ἔθν ἡοῦκοῦι ἀνναὺ ἐκεῖνοῦωε ἐρεοῦεῖλλο ἥρωμε  
 ε(Ϸ)ταλῆγ<sup>a</sup> | ἐροϷ ἐπεφραν πε ζεβεδαῖος μὴ πεφῳηρε σναὺ ἰακῳβος μὴ ἰωρᾶν-  
 νης. τότε ἡσ ἀφμοῦτε ἐπῆρῳηρε σναὺ αὐτὸ πεῦεῖωτ ἐφῆμοος ῖῆ πῃοι. ἀφῳαῃε  
 ἡῖμαὺ ἐφῃω ἡμος ἡαὺ ἥοι πενῃοεῖς ἡσ ἔε οὐεῖτηγῆτῆ ἥσῳι αὐτὸ ἀγογὰροῦ  
 ἥσῳι ἥτῆε ῖωων.

6b 15. πλῆν νενοῦηε ἥσῳι ἡπεφτοοῦ αὐτὸ ἀφῳτῆ ἥκεῳμοῦν ἡῖμαν αὐτὸ ἀῆρ  
 ἡῖτςνοοῦς ἥσον ἀλλὰ ἰοῦῃας πεπροῃοῃς πε πῃεῖμῖτςνοοῦς αὐτὸ ἡῖοῦωμ  
 ἡοῦοεῖκ ἡοῦωτ ῖι οῦσον μὴ νεν|ερῆγ. ἐρεοῦνοσ<sup>b</sup> ἥειρηνη ἡτεπνοῦτε κῳτε  
 ἐρον ἥσας νη<sup>c</sup> ἐνο ἡοῖετ ἡοῦωτ.

16. ὡ<sup>d</sup> οὔηρ ἡῖαεῖν ῖι ὡπῆρε ἀπεῃς<sup>e</sup> ἀαὺ ῖῆ τεπῃητε ἐνοῦηε ἥσῳι<sup>e</sup> ἐνναὺ  
 ἐροοῦ ῖῆ νενβαλ.<sup>f</sup> ἡαὶ ἐνῳανοῦω<sup>g</sup> ἐῃοοῦ τηροῦ ἡτῆῃαῳταγῆ<sup>h</sup> πεῃῃωκ ἀν  
 ὡα πεῖοοῦ ἡπενῃ<sup>i</sup> πῳῃε ἀλλὰ τῆῃαῃῃα ἥῖῃκοῦι<sup>j</sup> ἡαπομεροῦς<sup>k</sup> ἐβολ ἥῖητοῦ  
 ἡῖῃεῃεῃ ἐτῃῃῃ ἔεκας ἐῃῃῃ ὡπῆρε ἡτῃοκῃῃ ἡπεῃς<sup>e</sup>. 17. τῆῃσοῦν γὰρ ἔε  
 7a ἀπεῃς<sup>e</sup> ἐρητ ναν ἔε τετ|ῃαταῃε οεῖω ἐρῳανπεπῆῃ ἐτοῖαῃβ εῖ ἐπεςῃτ<sup>l</sup> ἐῃωτῆ  
 ἀλλὰ παντῳς σενῃτωοῦν ἐῖραι ἐῃων ἥσεῖωτῆ ἡμον ἡπατῆεγῃτῃεῖῃ ἡῖπο-  
 λῖς τηροῦ. 18. πετῆῃαῃῃῃ ἐπεῖῃωωμε ἐρῳανῃπῃςτος οῖωῃῃ ἐβολ σενῃποοῦ  
 ἐῖῃῃῃωωμε ἥσεῃῃτοῦ ἔῃν πολῖς ἐπολῖς αὐτὸ ἔῃν ῃωρα ἐῃωρα αὐτὸ ἔῃν ἐπαρ-  
 χῖα ἐεπαρχῖα<sup>m</sup> ἔεκας ἐρῳανῃῃῃῃ ἡπεῃς<sup>e</sup> ῃοῖοῦτ ἡμον ἐνῃαερ ὅε ῖως ἐνταῃε  
 οεῖω ἡῖτῆ.

7b 19. ἀῃωωπε ἔε ἡοῖεοοῦ ἀνεῖ ἐνβῃκ ἐγπολῖς | ἐῃ σῃω ἐρεπενῃωτηρ οῖηε  
 ἥσῳν. ἀῖρωμε ἥρεφῃτελος ἀῃῃτε ἡῖς ἐφῃω ἡμος ἔε πῃῃῃ ἔεῖς τεκῃτε

<sup>a</sup> M ἐταλῆγ. <sup>b</sup> P fol. 2<sup>ro</sup> col.a begins at this point. <sup>c</sup> P omits ἥσας νη. <sup>d</sup> P omits ὡ.  
<sup>e</sup> P omits ἐνοῦηε ἥσῳι. <sup>f</sup> P ἡῖβαλ. <sup>g</sup> P ἡῖωανοῦω. <sup>h</sup> P ἡτῆῃαῃῃε. <sup>i</sup> P ἡπενῃε.  
<sup>j</sup> P τῆ[ῃα]ῃε ῖῃκοῦι. <sup>k</sup> P ἀῃῃ μερος. <sup>l</sup> P ἐῖραι. <sup>m</sup> P ὡα ἐπαρχῖα.

13. And after he had been baptized he passed by and saw me, Peter, and Andrew, my brother. He went up to us and said to us: "Follow me, and I shall make you fishers of men." We, then, were full of joy, we followed him, I and Andrew, and we have not returned to our loved ones from then on, and we all followed him.<sup>25</sup>

14. As we, then, went a little further we saw another fishing boat with an old man on board, whose name was Zebedee, together with his two sons, James and John. Then Jesus called the two young men and their father, who sat in the boat. Our Lord Jesus spoke with them, saying: "Follow me!" And they followed him, as we ourselves had done.<sup>26</sup>

15. But we followed him with four men only, and he also chose eight others with us. And we were twelve brothers, but Judas, the traitor, was the twelfth. And we ate one bread together with each other. A great peace of God surrounded us on every side, and we were of one mind.

16. Oh, how many signs and wonders Christ has done in our midst when we followed him and saw them with our own eyes. If we wanted to tell them all, we would not be able to relate them in full before the day of our death.<sup>27</sup> But we will write down a few of them in succession for the generations to come, so that they will marvel at the trial of Christ. 17. For we know that Christ has promised us: "You will preach when the Holy Spirit comes down upon you." But they will certainly rise against us and kill us before we have preached the Gospel to all the cities. 18. As to what we shall write down in this book, when the faithful come forth they will copy it into other books and take them from city to city and from country to country and from province to province, so that, when the enemies of Christ kill us, it will be as if we are still preaching to you.

19. It happened, then, on a certain day that we were about to enter a city in order to teach, while our Saviour was following us. A tax collector stopped Jesus, saying: "Master, give your didrachme now that you are entering the

---

<sup>25</sup> Matthew 4:18–20; Mark 1:16–18. The words of Jesus are a literal quotation of Matthew 4:19 in the Sahidic version. The remark 'We have not returned' is an uncanonical addition, but see Mark 10:28; Matthew 19:27; Luke 18:28. The phrase 'And we all (τῶν) followed him' is awkward, since it only involves Peter and Andrew; originally ἐπὶ τῶν, 'wholly'?

<sup>26</sup> Mark 1:19–20; Matthew 4:21–22. 'Another fishing boat': according to Mark 1:16 and Matthew 4:18, Peter and Andrew did not fish from a boat. The words 'Follow me' are an inference from Mark 1:20 and Matthew 4:21: ἐκάλεισεν αὐτούς.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. John 20:30 and 21:25.

εκβηκ εζοϋν ετπολις. ις δε αqταας ναq αγω πραν ιπρωμε ετμηαγ πε λεγει.  
αγω<sup>a</sup> ιπτερενωκ εζοϋν ετπολις αqρ παρρε<sup>b</sup> ευμνηωε αγω αραρ πιστευε εροq.<sup>c</sup>

20. ευνηγ δε εβολ ας σωqτ αqναγ ελεγει εqρμοος ρι πεqτελwμιον. πεξε ις  
ναq δε ογαρκ ιςωι αqτωοϋν αqογαρq ιςωq. αqπεεεε πεqραν αqμογτε εροq  
8a δε ματθαιος | αγω πwνε ιμε ετταεινγ.

21. πλην δε ξε ινενταωε πωαξε επερογο (ε)νητανρε εροογ ευσηε ενεγαг-  
гелион ετογαав. πλην ιμησα ιμαειν τηρογ ιταqααγ αηιογΔαι αρχει ινωγςς  
εροq κατα θε ιταλογkας πεγαггелиςтнς таμον. αλλα σωтн татамωтн  
хηтаγноγςς εροq εтве ογ ιςι ιαρχιερεγς ιηιογΔαι.

22. ιπεογoειω εтμηαγ νερεπλαος ιηωηре ιπιηλ † ιηηнос ιΔωρον επρπε  
8b ιηιηηι ογμνηωε ιςσοογ ρι βροομπε ρι τpικон κατα πνομος | ιμωγςнς πνωγв  
μη πραг μη пвасенб ευ† ιμοογ ρωс ремнт ρа νεγнове. ιςσοογ μη ιβαамπε  
μη нетpикон μη пнег μη псамит наι ερεηолокаγтwма не. αγω νεγβηк τηρογ  
ιςι пгeнос τηрq ιηωηре ιπιηλ ευ† ιμοογ ρа νεγμηтатсsoογн μη ρηкаωηн  
ιηηααγ.

23. λοιπον ιтереπεнсωтнр таωе oειω ξε αμηтн ωарoi ογон ιιμ εтpосе  
9a αγω εтотн αγω анок †на† емтон нηтн. qi ιпанагв εрраι | εхωтн панагв гар  
ρoλб αγω сасωογ ιςι таетпw. αγω ιтере νερεογн ιιμ нηγ ωарoq εгталбo  
ιμοογ τηρογ. 24. αqтоγнес тωеере ιιαειρος παρχηсγнагwгос αγω πωηре

<sup>a</sup> P omits αγω.

<sup>b</sup> P αqταασε.

<sup>c</sup> P fol. 2<sup>vo</sup> col. 2 breaks off at this point.

city.” Jesus gave it to him; and the name of that man was Levi.<sup>28</sup> And as we had entered the city he healed many people and many believed in him. 20. When they,<sup>29</sup> then, went out, Jesus looked and saw Levi sitting in his custom house. Jesus said to him: “Follow me!” He rose and followed him. And he (Jesus) changed his name and called him Matthew and “Precious Pearl.”<sup>30</sup>

21. But let us not speak amply about the things we found written in the holy Gospels. But after all these signs he did, the Jews began to be angry with him, as Luke the Evangelist has informed us.<sup>31</sup> But listen and let me tell you for what reason the chief priests of the Jews were angry with him.<sup>32</sup>

22. In that time, the people of the children of Israel gave great gifts to the temple of Jerusalem: many sheep, pigeons and turtle doves, in accordance with the law of Moses, gold, silver and tin, which they gave as tithes for their sins. The sheep and the goats and the turtle doves and the oil and the fine flour were used for burnt offerings.<sup>33</sup> And the whole race of the children of Israel went and gave them in their ignorance, with many other things.

23. When, then, our Saviour preached, (he said): ‘Come to me, every one who is troubled and laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, for my yoke is easy and my load is light.’<sup>34</sup> And thus every one came to him and he healed them all.<sup>35</sup> 24. He raised the daughter of Jairus, the head of the

<sup>28</sup> A conflation of the story of the temple tax, which was a didrachme (Matthew 17:24–27, where the question is addressed to Peter), with that of the calling of Levi (Mark 2:14; Luke 5:27–28) or Matthew (Matthew 9:9).

<sup>29</sup> At this point, the author seems to forget that he pretended to quote from an apostolic writing, though the ‘they’ might be taken to include the many who believed in Jesus. In any case, the alleged quotation ends with § 20. The ‘we’ at the beginning of § 21 refers to Pseudo-Cyril.

<sup>30</sup> The term *ὄνη ἡμέ*, ‘precious stone,’ could also have the more limited sense of ‘pearl,’ e.g. in Matthew 13:45, where the Coptic translation reads *ὄνη ἡμέ* for *μαργαρίτας* (ed. H. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament*, vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911 [reprinted Osnabruck: Otto Zeller, 1969], 136). Cf. Theodosius of Alexandria, *On John the Baptist*, 15, 1 (ed. Kuhn, CSCO 268 [text], 42; 269 [translation], 36): ‘Let us summon the precious pearl (*πικρακαργίς ἡμέ*), the evangelist Matthew.’

<sup>31</sup> The reference is to Luke 11:53: *ἤρξαντο δεινῶς ἐνέχειν*; the Sahidic Bible translation here reads: *ἀνεγράμματα ... ἀρχεῖ ἡττινοῦτῷ ἐροῦ* (Horner, *Coptic version of the New Testament*, vol. II, 234/5: ‘... began to provoke him’).

<sup>32</sup> From here on the author begins to follow his apocryphal source about Pilate; see pp. 35–36.

<sup>33</sup> The Israelites did not give tithes ‘for their sins’; in the Bible, gold, silver and tin are never mentioned in this connection. For the animals used in burnt offerings (or whole offerings), see Leviticus 1:12–6; 12:6. Fine flour and oil are mentioned in Leviticus 14:10–34, together with sheep, turtle doves and pigeons (purification of a man cured from a malignant skin disease).

<sup>34</sup> Matthew 11:28, 29a and 30.

<sup>35</sup> For the healings recorded in §§ 24–28 and for parallels in the apocryphal literature on Pilate, see above pp. 36–37.



9b ἡ τεχνηρα ἐτῆν ἡ αἰν. ἀφταλῶς πωνήρε ἡ πωσιλικος ἀγὼ πωνήρε ἡ πρεκατονταρ-  
 хос. 25. ἀφτῇ ἡ πογοεῖν ἡ πβλλε ἡ νῖσε ἀγὼ πβλλε снaγ ἐτῆμοос ρατῆν τεῖρῖν ἀγὼ  
 ἀφταλῶς πετснῶс мῆν πετῳоуоу. 26. ἀφнех тлөгөдөн ἡ δαῖμονιον ἐβολ ρῆ  
 10a πρῶμε | ἀἡ δαῖμονιον βῶσε ἐροῦν ἐῆрῖр ἀἡрῖр βῶσε еθaлaccа ἀγмоу. ἀπρῶμε  
 οὔχαι ἀφβωк еπεφнῖ. ἀφнех саῳῳ ἡ δαῖμονιον ἐβολ ρῆ маrῖa тмагдалῖнн.  
 27. ἀφсмоу πт-оу ἡ οеῖк ἀγὼ псаῳῳ ἀγῖннῳе ἡ ρῶμε οὔωн ἐβολ ἡ ρηтоу ἀγὼ  
 сеоу ἡ сῖ ἡ ἡтаусеene εаγмеῖ саῳῳ ἡ вῖр ἡ оусоп ἀγὼ ἡ ἡтснооус ἡ вῖр ἡ оусоп.  
 ἀφмооуе ρῖхῆ ἡ αλaссa ἡ өе ἡ πпетῳоуоу. 28. ἀφталῶς тесῖме ерепесноу  
 10a ρaрос ἡ ἡтснооусе ἡ ρомпе | ἀφталῶς оуρῶме ἡ ργтpопкос εаῳῖр нaвῳннне  
 ἡ ρомпе ρῆ πεῳῳωме.

29. ναῖ δε ἀφααγ ἡ сῖ ἡ αἰ ἀῳῖр πεγροуо ρῆ псаббатон. ἀρῆнос ἡ μῖннῳе  
 οὔαροу ἡ сῳῳ етве ἡ нaεῖн енеῳре ἡ мооу. ἀγὼ ἡ тeῖре ἀγλο εγῖа рeмнт нaγ  
 еῑрῖпе αλλα неγпнт тнроу ераτῖ ἡ нῖс еγῖωρῖт ἡ мооу ρаpaтῖ ἡ нῖс еγῖт нaγ  
 ἡ πпоув ἡ ἡ ρατ ἡ ἡ неγроῖте еγῖωρῖт ἡ мооу ρa неῳоуeнте кaтa өе етснῖ  
 ρῆ ἡ еγaггeλῖон етoγaб.

10b 30. | ἡ οὔαс δε ρῶῳ неῳῳвῖт ἡ нетоуноухе ἡ мооу епекaсoφγлaкῖон.  
 ἀπδῖaβoлoс нoухе ἡ πeῖмeεуе еθooу ἐροῦн етeῳсῖме етве хе оγῖaῖзomῖт тe.  
 етве пaῖ ἡ тастрeчпapaдῖaоу ἡ пxoeῖс ρa нaбв ἡ ρaт.

31. нaрeнктон ехeн ттoλмнpῖa ἡ ἡ οὔαaῖ хе ρῖтῆ аῳ ἡ aῖтῖa аἡ οὔαaῖ  
 мeстe пeнcῳтнp ῳaнтoуῳῖне ἡ сa мооутῖ хῖн ἡ ῳорῖ. ἡ тeрeῖмннῳе δε  
 11a нaγ енeнaεῖн етeрeῖс eῖpe ἡ мооу ἀγβωк ἀγoγaρoу ἡ сῳῳ ρῆ нa нῖм | ἀγὼ  
 неγпстeуе ἡ сῖ ἡ ἡμннῳе eнaῳῳоу. ἀγὼ оὔон нῖм етпῖстeуе eῖс ἀγло еγвнк

synagogue, and the son of the widow at Nain. He healed the son of the royal servant and the son of the centurion. 25. He gave the light to the blind-born man and to the two blind men who sat beside the way. And he healed the paralysed and the withered man. 26. He threw the legion of demons out of the man: the demons hastened into the swines and the swines rushed into the sea and died. The man was healed and went to his house. He cast seven demons out of Mary Magdalene. 27. He blessed the five and the seven breads; many people ate of them and the scraps that remained were numerous and filled seven baskets one time and twelve baskets the other time. He walked upon the sea like on dry land.<sup>36</sup> 28. He healed the woman who had suffered from haemorrhage for twelve years. He healed a dropsical man who had been ill for 38 years.<sup>37</sup>

29. Jesus, then, did these things and most of them he did on the Sabbath.<sup>38</sup> Great multitudes followed him because of the signs he did. And thus they stopped bringing tithes to the temple, but they all hastened to Jesus and fell down at the feet of Jesus, giving him the gold and the silver and their cloaks which they spread out under his feet, as it is written in the holy Gospels.<sup>39</sup>

30. Judas, however, stole what they put into the treasury.<sup>40</sup> The devil put this wicked thought into his wife because she was a money lover. For that reason, she made him deliver up the Lord for 30 silver pieces.<sup>41</sup>

31. Let us return to the insolence of the Jews. For what reason did the Jews hate our Saviour so much that they sought to kill him from the beginning? Well, as the crowds saw the signs which Jesus did they began to follow him everywhere, and a large number of people believed. And every one who

<sup>36</sup> This comparison is already found in Athanasius, *De incarnatione verbi*, 18, 6: ἐπέβαινε καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ καὶ περιεπάτει ὡς ἐπὶ γῆς; see also Pseudo-Athanasius, *On the Resurrection of Lazarus*, ed. Bernardin, 'The Resurrection of Lazarus,' fol. 109<sup>va</sup> (text), 263 (transl.): 'and the sea upon whose waters he walked as upon a stony rock.'

<sup>37</sup> Pseudo-Cyril or his source apparently identified the dropsical man of Luke 14:1–6 with the man of John 5:1–15, who had been crippled for 38 years.

<sup>38</sup> The emphasis on the sabbath goes back to the tradition of the *Acta Pilati*; see p. 36. But the Gospels, too, say that Jesus did many of his miracles on the sabbath, for instance the healing of the dropsical and the crippled man mentioned in the preceding note.

<sup>39</sup> This motif derives from the story of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, Matthew 21:8; Mark 11:8; Luke 19:36.

<sup>40</sup> The small 'money box' (γλωσσόκομον), the common purse of John 12:6, is replaced here by the much greater 'offertory box, treasury' (γαζοφυλάκιον, κακοφυλακίον) of Mark 12:41 and 43, Luke 21:1 and John 8:1, apparently because it supposedly contained the gold and silver the Jews brought to Jesus.

<sup>41</sup> That Judas' wife induced him to betray Jesus is also found in E. Revillout, *Les apocryphes coptes*, Première partie (PO, II, 2), Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907, 40–41 (156–157), Fragn. 5. See also §§ 62–66. The 30 silver pieces are mentioned in Matthew 26:16 and 27:3 and 9.

ετςγναγωγη ν̄νιογ̄δαι εγειρε κατα πνομος ἡμωγςнс аγω ἡσε† ρεμнт наγ аη  
 хе аγнаγ енезвнγе ἡπχοεис.

32. ἡαρχιερεγς δε ἡτερογнаγ επεγωωτ ἡμιν ἡμοογ аγω πχωωρε εвол  
 ἡτεγςγнаγωγη аγωαхе ἡῖ ἡαρχιερεγς ἡἡ ἡсаз еτωω ἡπνομος хе марен-  
 11b τωογн ἡт̄нвоκ ωα ἡαρχων ἡἡ ἡноῖ ἡπλαос ἡт̄нωαхе επеγзнт етве пωнре  
 ἡπгам|ωе хе ἡтоγ пентаγωωγ ἡтςγнаγωγη. 33. аγω аγτωογн аγвоκ ωα  
 ἡαρχων еγχω ἡмос хе ω плаос ἡпистос еисзнтте тет̄нсоογн хе а̄м̄нннωе  
 ло еγвнκ еп̄п̄е аγαθεтеи ἡпеннномос аγвоκ аγογαγογ ἡса пωнре ἡпгамωе.  
 етет̄нωαηαηихе қηасек пнннωе ωαρογ ἡqr̄ п̄п̄е ἡхаеин ἡκκαταрг̄еи ἡпен-  
 номос ἡтеп̄н̄л̄ т̄нр̄̄ х̄ι ωп̄е εвол хе еγχω ἡмос хе анок пе пωнре ἡпноγте  
 12a аγω ἡтоγ аη пе аλλα τεγмааγ | те мага аγω पेचेиωт пе ιωснф аγω ογεвол  
 пе з̄м̄ пензеенос.

34. аογα δε ογωωб̄ з̄м̄ плаос ογαααскаλωс пе ἡноῖ εвол з̄н̄ π̄н̄л̄ т̄нр̄̄.  
 ἡтереγсωт̄т̄и е̄наρχιερεγς ἡἡ ἡноμολααскаλωс еγωп̄е ἡса μογογт̄ ἡ̄с̄ з̄н̄  
 ογκρογ п̄εхаγ наγ хе тет̄нсоογн ἡτωт̄н̄ хе ἡтаγх̄п̄е пωнре ἡпгамωе т̄ων.  
 ἡтоογ δε аγκα ρωογ. 35. αιωснф ογωωб̄ хе анок †соογн ἡτεγмааγ ес̄н̄ρογн  
 12b еп̄п̄е есω̄м̄ωе г̄агат̄̄ ἡzαχαгас πογн|нв ἡἡ сγμεωн пет̄м̄н̄сωγ ἡ̄е ἡ̄к̄е-  
 пар̄енос т̄нроγ ἡп̄н̄л̄. 36. ἡтерес̄ ам̄̄т̄сноογсе δε ἡром̄п̄е аγ̄р̄ з̄о̄те хе  
 ἡненесωн̄т̄ ἡнез̄иом̄е т̄нроγ ωωп̄е ἡмос. λοιπον ιωснф пет̄ере̄ἡαρχιερεγς  
 ωαхе ероγ неч̄о ἡх̄нра хе неаτεγс̄з̄ӣме μογ ката πτωω ἡρωме н̄м̄. λοιπον

believed in Jesus stopped going to the synagogue of the Jews and acting according to the law of Moses, and they no longer gave tithes because they saw the works of the Lord.

32. When, then, the chief priests saw their own shortage<sup>42</sup> and the dissolution of their synagogue, the chief priests and the teachers of the law said: 'Let us rise and go to the rulers and the chiefs of the people and let us speak to their hearts because of the son of that carpenter, for he is the man who has destroyed the synagogue.' 33. And they rose and went to the rulers, saying: 'Oh faithful people, behold, you know that the crowds have stopped going to the temple; they have rejected our law and have begun to follow the son of the carpenter. If you refrain from action, he will draw the multitude to him and make the temple desert and abolish our law, and the whole of Israel will be ashamed because he says: "I am the Son of God." And he is not, but his mother is Mary and his father is Joseph and he is one of our people.'<sup>43</sup>

34. But someone among the people answered; he was a great teacher in the whole of Israel.<sup>44</sup> As he heard that the chief priest and the teachers of the law sought to kill Jesus guilefully, he said to them: 'You know yourselves under which circumstances the son of the carpenter was born.'<sup>45</sup> They, however, kept silent. 35. Joseph answered: 'As for me, I know that his mother was in the temple and served Zechariah the priest and Simeon his successor, like all the other virgins of Israel. 36. However, when she was about twelve years old they were afraid lest she would get the manner of all women. Joseph, then, whom the chief priests just mentioned, was a widower, for his wife had died in accordance with the destiny of every human being.

---

<sup>42</sup> The priests lost their means of income because the people ceased from paying the tithes.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Acta Pilati* I, 1, quoted on p. 36 above. For the 'son of the carpenter,' see Matth. 13:55; cf. Also Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Holy Cross*, 13 (ed. Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 84; Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts*, 188 [text], 766 [transl.]): 'They call him the son of [Budge: Joseph] the carpenter.'

<sup>44</sup> The 'someone' who speaks is Nicodemus, he is answered by Joseph of Arimathea, see §§ 35 and 38. In John 3:10 Nicodemus is called 'the teacher of Israel,' and in John 3:1 'a ruler of the Jews' (as in § 38). In §§ 11 and 12, Nicodemus is said to be 'the president of the synagogue' and 'a great man in the synagogue.'

<sup>45</sup> In the *Acta Pilati*, 2, 3–5 (ed. Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 224–228; de Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 434–436), the Jewish leaders say to Pilate that Jesus was born of fornication, which is immediately denied by twelve pious Jews who claim that they were present at the wedding of Joseph and Mary. Although the accusation of fornication is not mentioned by Pseudo-Cyril, the remark of Joseph and his story of the birth of Jesus in §§ 35–37 appear to be a response to the same allegation.

<sup>a</sup>Μ παμαρμαθαια.

They, then, betrothed Mary to Joseph.<sup>46</sup> 37. She conceived from a Holy Spirit and brought forth Christ, on the 29th of the month of Choiakh,<sup>47</sup> in the town of Bethlehem. And by now it is thirty years ago that these things happened. 38. Behold, what I have seen I have told you, Nicodemus, young man and ruler! Nicodemus answered: 'You have told me the whole truth, Joseph!'

39. Then Annas and Caiphas were angry with Joseph of Arimathea from that time on, and they sought to kill the holy Joseph. 40. Nicodemus, however, knew of their wrath against him. He said to them: 'Why are you angry with Joseph, the speaker of the truth? Did not the prophet say: "And you, Bethlehem, land of Judah, you are not the least among the rulers of Judah; for out of you will come forth a leader who will pasture my people Israel"?'<sup>48</sup> 41. Therefore, what Joseph has told us is true. If you do not believe that he is the Son of God, are you then also unable to believe what the prophet has said? They (the prophets) are the fathers of the people. And when you do not listen to the prophets you are opposed to the law and the truth. Nobody who falls short of<sup>49</sup> the law is able to teach from the law.'

42. After they had said these things to each other, they rose and each one went into his house, for it had become late. Nicodemus, however, was not

---

<sup>46</sup> The ultimate source of §§ 35 and 36 is *Proteuangelium Jacobi*, 7–9 (Mary in the temple), 24, 4 (Simeon; cf. Luke 2:25 ff.). But Pseudo-Cyril also includes later embellishments of the story: that Zechariah and Simeon (also a priest and Zechariah's successor!) served together in the temple and that there were more virgins like Mary, is not found in the *Proteuangelium* but in later related literature. In Pseudo-Cyril, *On the Virgin Mary*, 18 (ed. Campagnano 164/5), Zechariah and Simeon are said to have presided over the temple when Mary was brought there by her parents; there were also other (and older) virgins who served with her (19). Also according to Pseudo-Matthew, *Liber de ortu beatae Mariae*, 4, 1 (ed. J. Gijssels, *Pseudo-Matthaei Evangelium. Textus et commentarius* [CCA, 9], Turnhout: Brepols, 1997, 323), Mary is given to the 'contubernium virginum quae die noctuque in dei laudibus perseverabant'; cf. also *De nativitate Mariae* 6, 5 (ed. R. Beyers, *Libellus de nativitate sanctae Mariae. Textus et commentarius* [CCA, 10], Turnhout: Brepols, 1997, 301): 'virginem intra septa templi cum aliis virginibus ibidem educandis dimiserunt.' According to Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, 60, 2, the widowers and unmarried men of Israel could draw lots for the virgins of the temple.

<sup>47</sup> The month of Choiakh began on November 27 and ended on December 26.

<sup>48</sup> Matthew 2:6 (= Micah 5:1). In John 7:51–52, Nicodemus defends Jesus. The context of that passage concerns the question whether the Messiah might come from Galilee (vss. 41 and 52). The Jews denied this because Scripture had foretold that the Messiah was to be born in the town of Bethlehem (vs. 42). Pseudo-Cyril, who assumes that Nicodemus would have accepted this scriptural testimony, puts the prediction of Micah (in the version of Matthew) into Nicodemus' mouth. John 7:50 introduces Nicodemus with a reference to the story of John 3:1 ff.; Pseudo-Cyril continues with that story.

<sup>49</sup> Lit.: 'is below.'



indifferent at all but he went to Jesus by night. 43. He said to him: 'Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher who has come from God, for no man is able to do these signs you do unless God is with him.'<sup>50</sup> Jesus answered and said to him: 'Unless a man has been born out of water and Spirit, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.'<sup>51</sup> 44. Then Nicodemus answered: 'I believe everything you have said to me. May your mercy fall on me.' Jesus said to him: 'May it happen to you according to your belief.' 45. And Nicodemus went to his house, he brought all his money and gave it to Jesus so that he should give it to the poor. He received the pledge of belief and joyfully returned to his house.<sup>52</sup>

46. After these events, then, Jesus was in Galilee. He wanted to go to Jerusalem, as the Passover of the Jews, the Feast of the Tabernacles, was near at hand.<sup>53</sup>

47. Then Jesus said to his disciples: 'My soul is grieved to death because of Lazarus, our friend, for he has fallen asleep.'<sup>54</sup> Arise, let us go to his sisters and speak with them and their heart shall be comforted.' 48. His disciples, then, and his mother and a great multitude followed him.<sup>55</sup> They came to Bethany, where Lazarus had lived with Mary and Martha. 49. And as they saw Jesus they said to him: 'Lord, if you had been here my brother would not have died.'<sup>56</sup> Jesus said to them: 'If he has fallen asleep<sup>57</sup> he will rise again.' Martha said to him: 'I know that he will rise at the resurrection of the last day.' Jesus said to her: 'I am the Resurrection and the Life!<sup>58</sup> Show me, therefore, the tomb in which you have laid your brother.'<sup>59</sup> 50. As he, then, went many people followed him. As he went out to the tomb he called Lazarus out of

<sup>50</sup> John 3:2.

<sup>51</sup> John 3:5, but with the word 'see' (cf. vs. 3) instead of 'enter.'

<sup>52</sup> The 'pledge of belief' (παρηβή ἡτιςτις = ὁ ἀρραβών τῆς πίστεως) refers to baptism, cf. below § 112, Lampe, *Lexicon*, 229b s.v. ἀρραβών B. 3 and Sophocles, *Lexicon* I, 251/2 s.v. §§ 44 and 45 contain uncanonical additions.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. John 7:1–2. Pseudo-Cyril identifies the feast of the Tabernacles (September) with that of the Passover (Spring); he assumes that Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem began here and that it was on that journey that Lazarus was raised from the dead (cf. John 12:1).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. John 11:11. The rest of this paragraph is in sharp contrast with the canonical story; see John 11, 4 and 15!

<sup>55</sup> The Virgin Mary and the multitude are not mentioned in the canonical story; according to John 11, 19, there were already many Jews with Martha and Mary.

<sup>56</sup> John 11:21 and 32, where these words are separately spoken by Martha and Mary.

<sup>57</sup> In the canonical story this is not said by Jesus to Lazarus' sisters (John 11:22) but by the disciples to Jesus (John 11:12).

<sup>58</sup> John 11:24–25.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. John 11:34.



ελαζαρος εβολ ρ̅η̅ πταφος αqτογνοςq̅ εβολ ρ̅η̅ νετμοογт εneπεqттоογ пе  
xинтаqмоγ αqω αq̅p̅ q̅πнρε тнρογ εγпcteγe epoq.

16a 51. αν̅αρχιερεγс ѿωνт̅ н̅терoγcωт̅η̅ enαι ρωcте emoy|oyт̅ н̅ic̅. αqω н̅πογbен  
εγναp̅ oy εβολ xε азaρ пcтeγe epoq εβολ ρ̅η̅ ρeөнoc н̅и̅. nepeн̅ioγΔaи Δe q̅πne  
н̅ca oyλoιcε epoyн̅ eic̅ xεkac eγemoγoyт̅ н̅moq αqω neγp̅ ρote ρнтоγ н̅и̅mnнq̅e  
xε neγoq̅ н̅ρoyo epooγ αqω neγkω н̅pωoy xεkac eγnaaμaρte н̅ic̅ ρ̅η̅ oykpoy  
н̅cemoγoyт̅ н̅moq.

52. tote ic̅ aqιne eneγmoκmek xε neγcep παq̅ εβολ epoq. αqω aπkaιpoc  
q̅ωπε eтpeqωte н̅aΔaμ н̅и̅ neq̅q̅нpe н̅ceκtooy eтeγapxи н̅kecon н̅q̅bωk q̅a  
16b | пeq̅eωт̅ xε н̅oyεβολ an пе ρ̅η̅ пeικocμoc.

53. tote ic̅ пeχaq̅ н̅neq̅μαoнтнc xε тωoyн̅ μαpon eοiλнн̅ xε aneρooγ н̅aθav  
ρων epoyн̅. q̅ωe epon ebωk eoyωм̅ н̅пecooy н̅н̅peβpaиc kaтa θe н̅taπxoeic  
ρων eтooтq̅ н̅mωγчnc ρ̅η̅ πтooγ н̅cиnа. 54. αqω eic̅ρннтe п̅ωнpe н̅пpωme ceнa-  
таaq̅ eтooтoy н̅н̅pωme н̅peq̅p̅нoвe н̅cec̅p̅oy̅ н̅moq н̅cemoγoyтq̅ н̅q̅тωoyн̅ ρ̅η̅

the tomb and raised him from the dead.<sup>60</sup> It was the fourth day since he had died,<sup>61</sup> and they were all amazed and believed in him.<sup>62</sup>

51. When the chief priests heard these things they were so angry that they wanted to kill Jesus.<sup>63</sup> But they did not find what to do because many from every nation believed in him.<sup>64</sup> The Jews, then, sought a cause against Jesus in order to kill him, but they were afraid of the crowds<sup>65</sup> because they were too many for them. And they kept silence, intending to take Jesus guilefully and to kill him.

52. Then Jesus knew their thoughts, that they had set a trap for him. And the time had come that he would redeem Adam and his children and that they would return to their origin again<sup>66</sup> and that he would go to his Father, for he was not from this world.

53. Then Jesus said to his disciples: 'Arise, let us go to Jerusalem, for the days of unleavened bread are near at hand.'<sup>67</sup> We have to go and eat the sheep of the Hebrews as the Lord commanded Moses on Mount Sinai. 54. And behold, the Son of Man will be delivered into the hands of sinful men<sup>68</sup>

<sup>60</sup> John 11:43–44.

<sup>61</sup> John 11:17 and 39.

<sup>62</sup> John 11:45.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. John 11:46–53.

<sup>64</sup> Luke 19:48. Pseudo-Cyril changes 'the whole people' into 'every nation,' implying universal belief in Jesus.

<sup>65</sup> Matthew 21:46; Mark 12:12; Luke 20:19.

<sup>66</sup> This expression, which is also used in § 151, is frequently found in Coptic texts: Pseudo-Athanasius, *On the Passion of the Lord*, ed. J.B. Bernardin, 'A Coptic Sermon Attributed to St. Athanasius,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, 38 (1937) 118/119: God says to Adam: 'And I shall make you return to your origin'; Theodosius of Alexandria, *On the Falling Asleep and the Assumption of the Virgin*, ed. M. Chaîne, 'Sermon de Théodose,' 279 (text), 301 (transl.): 'until he (Christ) made us return to our origin,' and in the *Book of the Resurrection of Christ*, by Bartholomew the Apostle, 16 (ed. Westerhoff, *Auferstehung und Jenseits*, 78/79): 'He turned Adam to his origin'; an acrostic hymn *On Baptism*, in K.H. Kuhn and W.J. Tait (eds.), *Thirteen Coptic Acrostic Hymns from Manuscript M574 of the Pierpont Morgan Library*, Oxford: The Griffith Institute-Ashmolean Museum, 1996, 114/115 (Hymn 10, 24): 'Let us glorify God, for he turned us to our beginning.' The origin (or beginning) of Adam and his children is the Paradise of Delight, see § 58 and Pseudo-Cyril, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 10 and 18 (ed. Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 30/31 and 36/37): 'until I shall make man return to Paradise, his original home.' Other instances of the same expression in O. von Lemm, 'Kleine Koptische Studien, I,' in *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg*, XXV, 5 (1906) 191–193 (reprinted in Idem, *Kleine koptische Studien*, 463–465), who suggested to translate ἀρχή as 'rule' ('Herrschaft'), with reference to Gen. 1, 26, 28; 9, 7.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. the first and the third prediction of the passion: Matth. 16:21 and Matthew 20:18; Mark 10:33; Luke 18:31. The meal of the Passover, however, is not mentioned in that connection.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. the second prediction of the passion: Matthew 17:22; Mark 9:31; Luke 9:44.

17a πμερϱομῆντ ἡροοϱ. εἰςζηντε διταμωτῆ ἐνετῆαϱωπε ἡμοι. 55. τοτε πετροс  
 πεχαϱ | ἡῖς хε κογοх пхоеис ἡнепαι ϱωπε ἡмок. пехе ῖς наϱ хе ἡт῕ οϱскан-  
 Δαλον наi.

17b 56. τοτε μαρια τῖρρω ἡνεξηομε τηροϱ ἡпкoсmос ас† ἡпесοϱοι εἰς πεхас наϱ  
 хе паϱнре пай етемῆται ἡсавῥлаϱ †сωтῆ ерок теноϱ екϱахе мῆ нексннϱ  
 хе εἰнавок εῶἰῥῆм (εῶἰῥῆм)<sup>a</sup> тетρωтῆ ἡнепρoфнтис аϱω пῆῤ петемῆт῕ ϱμοт  
 ἡмаϱ хе сeϱиne ἡсoк εμοοϱт῕. 57. τωοϱη паϱнре тапoт ἡῖмак екнме  
 18a пмаиϱῆмо хе ἡнепeρeв|ραιос моοϱт῕. ω паϱнре ω паϱнре εἰςζηнте εἰс  
 тмeρмаaвe ἡρoмпe те таi εпнт ἡῖмак хin пoлic εпoлic етвe нетΔiωкeи  
 ἡсoк εϱοϱωϱ εμοοϱт῕ хе аϱхoос етвннт῕ хе ἡтoк οϱϱнре ἡῖρo. 58. τοτε  
 ῖς аϱнетῆ ϱωϱ ἡсoвe пeхаϱ хе ω тамааϱ ἡпeρpиme οϱΔe ἡпeρoкeм ἡζηт  
 хе διxоoc хе ἡioϱΔai сeнаρωтῆ ἡμοι. εϱϱаннmoοϱт oн †натωοϱη εвоῤ ϱῆ  
 18a нетmoοϱт ϱῆ пameρωмῆт ἡроοϱ таοϱωнῆ не εвоῤ тасoтe ἡΔaм | мῆ  
 неϱϱнре τηροϱ тахῖгоϱ εппараΔicос ἡпоϱноϱ.

59. ἡῖῆса наi непoϱa пe ἡῖioϱΔai. δις वोк eρpai εῶἰῥῆм мῆ неϱиaөн-  
 тис неpеткeнаpia ἡῖмаϱ пe. δις वोк eρoϱη eπῖppe аϱнаϱ εῖϱнре ἡῖρeвpeос

<sup>a</sup>M omits εῶἰῥῆм; see note to translation.

and they will crucify him<sup>69</sup> and kill him,<sup>70</sup> and he will rise on the third day.<sup>71</sup> Behold, I have told you about the things that will happen to me.' 55. Then Peter said to Jesus: 'Heaven forbid, Lord! This shall not happen to you.' Jesus said to him: 'You are a stumbling block to me.'<sup>72</sup>

56. Then Mary, the queen of all the women of the world, came to Jesus and said to him: 'My son, besides whom I have no one, I hear you now speaking with your brethren: "I shall go to Jerusalem"; <but Jerusalem> kills the prophets<sup>73</sup> and Israel has no mercy, for they seek to kill you. 57. Arise, my son, and let me flee with you to Egypt, which loves strangers, so that the Hebrews might not kill you. Oh my son, oh my son, behold, by now it is thirty years ago that I fled with you from city to city because of your persecutors who wanted to kill you, because it was said of you that you were a royal son.' 58. Then Jesus smiled and said: 'Oh my mother, do not weep and do not be gloomy of heart because I have said that the Jews will kill me. When they kill me I shall rise again from the dead on the third day and I shall appear to you<sup>74</sup> and I shall redeem Adam and all his children, and I shall lead them to the paradise of delight.'

59. After this it was the feast of the Jews. Jesus went up to Jerusalem together with his disciples; Mary, too, was with him.<sup>75</sup> Jesus went into the temple<sup>76</sup> and saw that the children of the Hebrews sold cattle, pigeons and

<sup>69</sup> Only to be found in Matthew's version of the third prediction of the Passion: Matthew 20:19.

<sup>70</sup> Mentioned in all predictions of the Passion, though not by all Evangelists: Matthew 16:21; 17:23; Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34; Luke 9:22; 18:33.

<sup>71</sup> In all predictions of the Passion, Luke 9:44 excepted.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Matthew 16:22–23.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Matthew 23:37. The text of Pseudo-Cyril agrees with the Sahidic version of Matthew 23:37, where  $\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\rho\omega\tau\bar{\iota}\ \bar{\iota}\nu\epsilon\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  is a relative clause (= Gr.  $\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ), but because of the addition of 'and Israel has no mercy' (lit. 'and it is Israel that has no mercy,' cf. Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, 370, § 464), it would seem necessary to interpret the remark on Jerusalem in the same way, lit. 'It is she who kills the prophets.'

<sup>74</sup> Cf. John 20:11–18. In the Coptic Church, Mary of Magdala was generally identified with Mary, the Mother of Jesus (and with other Marias as well); see also § 155 below and e.g. Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 5 and 36 (ed. Campagnano, 26/7, 48/9); idem, *On the Resurrection*, 4, 14 (ed. Campagnano, 58/9, 64/5); idem, *On the Virgin Mary*, 10 (ed. Campagnano, 158/9), and the *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Bartholomew the Apostle*, 29–38 (ed. Westerhoff, *Auferstehung und Jenseits*, 96/97–118/119). On both Mary's also Kaestli & Cherix, *Évangile de Barthélemy*, 168–170, and S.J. Shoemaker, 'Rethinking the Gnostic Mary: Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9 (2001) 555–595.

<sup>75</sup> John 2:12.

<sup>76</sup> Matthew 21:12; Mark 11:15; Luke 19:45.

ԵՂԻ ԷՅԵ ԵՅՈԼ ՉԻ ԾՐՈՈՄՔԵ ՉԻ ԵՏՕՕՅ ՉՆ ՆԵՏՈՅԷԻՆԵ ՄՄՕՕՅ ՆԱԿ ԵՐՐՔԵ. ԵՂՐ ՉՕԾՕ  
 ԵՆԵՕՅՆԻՅ ՄՆ ՆԼԵԿԵԻՏԻՏ ԵՂԻ ՄՄՕՕՅ ԵՅՈԼ ՆՅՆԿՕՕՅԵ ՃԵ ՄՆ ՉՁՂ ՆԿՁ ՊՐՕՓ  
 ՆՆՉԵՅՐԱԻՕ ՃԵ ՉՆՐՆՆՅՕԻԼԵ ՉՎՕՅ ՆԵ ՉՆ ՕԿՁՂ ՆՔՎՕՅ ԱՆ ՔԵ.

18b 60. ԸԻՇ ԿԱՄԷ ՕԿՆԱՏԻԴՁ ԵՅՈԼ ՉՆ | ՉԵՆՈՅՂ ԶԳՈՅՃԵ ԵՅՈԼ ՆՆԵՏՎՈՓ ՄՆ  
 ՆԵՒԻ ԵՅՈԼ ԵԳՃՎ ՄՄՕՍ ՃԵ ՔԱՆԻ ԵՂՆԱՄՕՅԿԵ ԵՐՕԳ ՃԵ ՔՆԻ ՄՔԵՎԼՆԼ ՆՒՎՏՆԻ ԸԵ  
 ԱՏԵՏՆԱԳ ՆՏՔՆԼԱԻՈՆ ՆՏՕՕՆԵ. ԶԿՎ ԶԳՎՐՎՐՔՐ ՆՆԵՏՐԱՔԴՁԱ ՆՆԵՏՃԻ ԿՕԼՅՄՅՈՆ  
 ԶԳՆՈՒՕՅ ԵՅՈԼ ՉՆ ՔԵՐՔԵ.

19a 61. ԶԿՎՎ ԵՅՈԼ ԵԳՃՎ ՄՄՕՍ ՃԵ ՉԱՄՆՆ ՉԱՄՆՆ ԴՃՎ ՄՄՕՍ ՆՆՏՆ ՃԵ ՔԵՏՎՏՏՆ  
 ԵՔԱՎՁԵ ՆՏԵՆԱՃԻ ԴՔԵ ԱՆ ՆՔՄՕՅ ՎՁ ԵՆԵՂ. ԿՕՏԵ ՆԱՐՒԵՐԵՅՏ ՄՆ ՆԵԴՐԱՄՆԱԵՅՏ  
 ՔԵՃԱԿ ՆՆԵԿԵՐՆԿ ՃԵ ԱՆԱԿ ԵՏՆՆՏՃԱՏԻՂՆԻ ՄՔՎՐՆԵ ՄՔԵԻՂԱՄ|ՎԵ ՔԵԻՐԵԿՏԱԿԵ-  
 ՆՕՄՕՍ. ԱՄՆԻՏՆ ՆՒՏՆՄՕՕՅԴՂ ՆՒԵՔԼԱՕՍ ՃՕՕՍ ՃԵ ՆՂՆԻՆԵ ԱՆ ՆԵՎՎՁԵ. ԱՅՐԱՉԱՄ  
 ԶԳՄՕՅ ՄԵՆ ՆԵՔՐՈՓՆԻՏ ԶԿՎ ՔԱԻ ՎՃՎ ՄՄՕՍ ՃԵ ՔԵՏՆԱՉԱՐԵՂ ԵՔԱՎՁԵ ՆՐՆԱՃԻ  
 ԿՔԵ ԱՆ ՆՔՄՕՅ ՎՁ ԵՆԵՂ. ՄՆ ԵՐԵՔԱԻ ՏՕՏՆ ՆՉՕԾՕ ԵԱՅՐԱՉԱՄ ՄՆ ՆԵՔՐՈՓՆԻՏ ԶԿՎ  
 ԵԻՏ ՔԵՂՏԱՓՕՍ ՕԾՈՂՉ ԵՅՈԼ ԿԵՆՕՅ. ԱՄՆԻՏՆ ՆՒՏՆՄՕՕՅԴՂ. ԶԿՎԻ ՎՆԵ ԸԵ ՃԵԿԱՏ ԵԿԵ-  
 ՆՕՅՃԵ ԵՐՕԳ ԶԿՎ ԶԳՉՕՓՂ ԶԿԵԻ ԵՅՈԼ ՉՆ ՔՐՔԵ.

19b 62. ՆԵՐԵՔՎՁԱԿԵ ԸԵ ՆՎՐՕՅԿՆԻՏԱԿԵ ՔԵՎՐԱՆ | ԻՕԿՃԱՏ ՄՕՕՎԵ ՆՄՆԱԳ ՉՆ ՆԱԻ  
 ԿՆՐՕԿ. ԶԿՎ ՆԵՏԵՎՁԱԿՎՈՔ ԿՆՐՕԿ ՎՐԱԵԻՕԿՃԱՏ ՅՈՒ ՆՎՃՕՕՅ ԵՏԵՎՏՅԻՆԵ ԵՅՕՕՅ.  
 ԱՏՎՎՈՔ ԸՆ ՔԵՉՕՕՅ ԵՏՆՆԱԿ ԶԻՕԿՃԱՏ ՅՈՒ ԶՎՃՆԵ ԿԵՎՏՅԻՆԵ ԵՅՕՕՅ ԵՆՆԻՏԱԿՎՎՈՔ  
 ԿՆՐՕԿ. 63. ՔԵՃԵ ԿԵՏԵՐԵՔՆՕՅՆ ՆԱՕՆԿՔ ՄՔԵՏԵՐԵՔՆՕՅՆ ՆԱՕՆԿՂ ՉՆ ՕԾԵՔՆ ՃԵ  
 ԵԻՏՂՆՆԵ ԴՆԱԿ ԵՐՕԿ ԵԿՔԵՐԻՏԱ ՉՆ ՉԵՆՆՕՅ ՆՉԻՏԵ ԶԿՎ ՉՆ ՉԵՆԿԱՅՎՈՆ ՄՔԵՉՕՕՅ ՄՆ  
 20a ՕԿՐՐԻՏՔ ՆՒԵԿՎՆ ԶԿՎ ՆՂԻ ԶՆԿ ԱՆ ՆԼԱԶԿ ԱԼԼԱ ՔԵՏԵԿՅԻՆԵ ՄՄՕՎ ԵԿՅԻՆԵ | ՄՄՕՎ  
 ՉՆ ՕԿՆՆՏՐԵՎՃԻՕԿԵ. 64. ԱԼԼԱ ԵԿՎՁԱՆՎՏՏՆ ՆՏՎԱԻ ԴՆԱԿՄՕԿ ԵՔԵՆՏԱՎԵԻ ԵՔԱՂՆԻ.  
 ԵԻՏՂՆՆԵ ԿՃՎ ՄՄՕՍ ՃԵ ԵԻՏ ՆՆՕՅ ՆՔԼԱՕՍ ՎՐԻՆԵ ՆՏԱ ԻՇ ԵՄՕԾՕՅԿ ՄՄՕՎ ՉՆ ՕԿՐՕԿ.  
 ՄԱՐՕՅՏՄՆԻՏ ՆՄՆԱԿ ՃԵ ՎՁԱԿԻ ՕԿ ՆԱԿ ՆՂՔԱՐԱԸԼԱՕԿ ՄՄՕՎ ՆԱԿ. 65. ՆՒՕՎ ԸԵ  
 ԻՕԿՃԱՏ ՔԵՃԱԳ ՆՒԵՎՏՅԻՆԵ ՃԵ ԱՆՈՎՏ ԱՔԱՏՁ ԵԻՆԵ ԵՔԵՆՏԱՐՃՕՕԿ ԵՏՅՆՆԻՏՂ ԶԿՎ  
 ԴՎՐՔԵ ԵՅՈՒ ՎՐԱՐՕՎ ՃՆՆԵՎՃՔՈԻ. ՔԵՃԵ ԿԵՎՏՅԻՆԵ ՆԱԳ ՃԵ ԵՎՁԵ ԿԱԻ ԿԵ ԵԵ ԿՎՕՅՆ  
 20b ՆՂՅՈՒ ՎՐԱՐՕՅ ՆՏՕՕՅԿՆ ՆՂՏԻ|ՄՆ ՔԵԿՂՎՅ ՆՄՆԱԿ ՃԵ ԵՂՆԱԿԻ ՕԿ ՆԱԿ ՆՂՔԱՐԱԸԼԱՕԿ  
 ՄՄՕՎ ՆԱԿ.

sheep<sup>77</sup> of those they had brought to the temple. Because these were too many for the priests and the Levites they sold them to others; for the Hebrews do not have much land, since they are sojourners in a land that is not theirs.<sup>78</sup>

60. Jesus made a whip of cords<sup>79</sup> and cast the buyers and the sellers out, saying: 'My house shall be called the house of prayer but you have made it a cave of robbers.' And he upset the tables of the money changers and cast them out of the temple.<sup>80</sup>

61. And he cried out saying:<sup>81</sup> 'In truth, in truth I tell you: Who listens to my word shall never taste of death.' Then the chief priests and the scribes said to each other: 'See the arrogance of the son of that carpenter, this destroyer of the law. Come, let us kill him so that the people will say that his words are not true. Abraham has died and the prophets, and this man says: "Who shall keep my word shall never taste of death." Is this one better than Abraham and the prophets? And see, their tomb can still be seen.<sup>82</sup> Come, let us kill him!' They, then, picked up stones to throw at him, but he hid himself and went out of the temple.

62. That impious man now, whose name is not worthy to be uttered, Judas, accompanied him in all this. And Judas was used to go and tell his wicked wife everything that happened. And it occurred on that day that Judas went and told his wicked wife everything that had happened. 63. She whom the abyss will swallow up said to him whom the abyss will swallow up without delay: 'Behold, I see that you are wasting time in great sufferings, both in the burning heat of the day and the darkness of the night, and that you do not gain anything, but what you get you get by theft. 64. But if you listen to me, I shall tell you what has entered my mind. Behold, you say: "See, the elders of the people seek to kill Jesus guilefully." Let them make an arrangement with you about what they will pay you to deliver him to them.' 65. But Judas said to his wife: 'In truth, my master knows already what you have said about him. And I am ashamed to go to him lest he blame me.' His wife said to him: 'Surely, this is the way, arise and go to them immediately and settle your affairs with them, namely what they will pay you to deliver him to them.'

---

<sup>77</sup> John 2:14. The rest of this section is an uncanonical addition. The idea seems to be that Jesus was angered by the fact that the Jews did not give the superfluous sacrificial animals to the temple but sold them to private persons.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Genesis 15:13.

<sup>79</sup> John 2:15.

<sup>80</sup> Matthew 21:12–13; Mark 11:15–17; Luke 19:45–46.

<sup>81</sup> This section is a free rendering of John 8:51–59.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Matthew 23:29; not in John 8:52–53.

66. ԻՅՎԱԸ ԵՔ ԶԳՏՈՒՄ ՆՇԱ ԴԵԳՇԻՄԵ ԵԹՈՕՅ. ԶԳԵ ԴՅԱ ՆԱՐՄԻԵՐԵՅՍ ՔԵՃԱԳ  
 ՈՂ ԶԵ ՕԳ ՔԵՏԵՆՈՅԵԾ ԴԱԶ ՈՒ ԴԱՐԱՐԱԴԻՈՅ ՆՈՉ ՆԻՏՆ ԴՇՈՕՆ ԴԱՐ ԶԵ  
 ԵՏԵՆՈՅԻՄ ՆՇԱ ՄՈՕՂԴ. ՆՔԵՆԵԾԵՆԾՈՄ ԵՐՈԳ ԶՂՈ ԵԾՈՔԵ ԵՏԵՆՈՅԾՈՅ ԶՈԿ  
 ՔԵՆԱՐԱՐԱԴԻՈՅ ՆՈՉ ՆԻՏՆ. ԶՂՈ ԶԾՄՆԻՏԻ ՆՆՈՂ ԵՄԱՅ ՆՂԱԴ. ԶԳԵ ԵՅՈԼ  
 21a ՂԻՏՈՏՈՅ ԶԳՅՈԿ ԵՐԱԴՂ ՆԻՇ ՈՆ ՆԱՓՈՏՈԼՈՏ ԴԻՐՈՅ ՂՅՈ ԵԾՈՔԵ ՈՆ | ԼԱԶ ՆՂՅՈՅ  
 ԵՔԴԻՐԴ.

67. ԵՏԵ ՆՇԱԳ ՆՆԵԳՄԱԾԵՆԻՇ ԶԵ ԵՏԵՆՇՈՕՆ ԶԵ ՔԵՐՈՕՅ ՆԴԱԾԵՄ ՔՆՆԵՅՈԼ  
 ՂՆ ԿԻՄԵ ՔԵ ՐԱՏԵ ԵՏԵ ՇՈՂԱ ՆՔԵՅՈՒ ՔԱՐՄՈՅԵ ՔԵ ԶՂՈ ԵԻՇՆԻՏԵ ՔՇԱՅՅԱՏՈՆ  
 ՔԵ. 68. ԶՂՈ ԶՔՇՈԵԻՇ ԶՈՆ ԵՏՈՏԴ ՆՈՄՈՅՇԻՇ ՂՆ ՔՏՈՕՅ ՆՇԻՆԱ ԵԳՃՈ ՆՈՇ ԶԵ  
 ԾԱՃԵ ՈՆ ՆՈՒՐԵ ՆՔՆՆԼ ԵԿՃՈ ՆՈՇ ԶԵ ՂՐԱԻ ՂՆ ՔՈՕՅ ՆՂՈՕՅ ՆԴԱՔՇՈԵԻՇ ԵՆԴԻԿՆ  
 ԵՅՈԼ ՂՆ ՔԿԱՂ ՆՆԿԻՄԵ ԵՏԵՆՆԱՐ ՇԱԾՈՅ ՆՂՈՕՅ ԵՏԵՆԵՆԴՅՆԻՅ ԶՂՈ ԿԵՇԱԾՈՅ ՆՂՈՕՅ  
 21b ԵՏԵՆԱՕՅՈՄ ՆՂՆԱԾԱՅ. | ՆՆՆՇՈՇ ԵՏԵՆԱՃԻ ՆՈՅԵՇՈՕՅ ԵՆԱՆՈՅԳ ԵՄՆ ՃՅԻՆ ՂԻՅՈՅ  
 ՆԴԵՆԿՈՇ ՆՈՉ ԶՂՈ ՆԴԵՆՇՈՇ ՆՈՉ ՂՆ ՕԿՈՂԴ ՈՆ ՔԿԵՇԵՔԵ ՆՆԾԱՃԵ  
 ՆԴԱՔՆՈՅԵ ՃՈՕՅ ԵՄՈՅՇԻՇ. ԶԳՇԱԻ ԵՔ ԶՅՈՅ ՆՔՆՈՇ ԶԳԴԱԶ ՆՔԼԱՇ ԶՂՈ  
 ՇԵԻՐԵ ՆՔԱԻ ԾԱՂՐԱԻ ԵՔՈՕՅ ՆՂՈՕՅ. 69. ԴԵՆՈՅ ՇԵ ԴՅՈՆ ՆԴՆԾՈԿ ԵՔՈՂ ՆՔՔԱՇԱ  
 ԶԵ ՆՆԵՔԼԱՇ ՕՔԵՆ ԶՅՈ ԵՆԴ ՕՅՅԵ ՔՆՈՇ ԶԵ ԶՆԴ ՕՅԵՅՈԼ ՂՆ ԴԵՓՂՆ ՆՈՕՂԱ.  
 22a 70. ԶՂՈ ՕՂՆ ՕՂՅՈՅ ՂՆ ՔԱՂԻՏ ԵԻՕՅԾՈՅ ԵՏԱՄՈՒՆ ԵՐՈԳ ԶՂՈ ԵԻՇԱՆՃՈՕ | ԵՐՈՒՆ  
 ԵՏԴԱԼՅՔԵ ՆԾԵ ՆԴԱՇԼՅՆ ՆՇԻ ՄԱՐԻԱ ԴԱՄԱԶ ԵՏԴԱԵԻՅ ԶՂՈ ՕՆ ԵՏԴՆԱՄՈՒՆ  
 ԵՏԴՆԱՓԴ ԶՅՈ ԶԴՇՈՕՆ ԼԼԱ ԵԻՇ ՕՂԱ ՆՔԵԻՄԱ ՕՂՎԱՅՈԼՈՏ ՔԵ.

71. ԵՏԵ ՆՇ ԶԳԵ ԵԹՆՆԵՐԵՆԱՓՈՏՈԼՈՏ ՕՂՆՂ ՆՇՈՅ ԶՂՈ ՔԿԵԻՕՂԱԸ. ՆԵՇՈՂԱ  
 ՆՔԵՅՈՒ ՔԱՐՄՈՅԵ ՔԵ ՔԵՐՈՕՅ ԵՏԴՆԱՅ. ԼԻՕՂԱԸ ԾԱՃԵ ՈՆ ՆՈՕՂԱԻ ՂՆ ՕԿՐՈԳ  
 ԶՆՈՕՂԱԻ Դ ՈՂ ՆՂՆԱՓՈՅՐՈՅՇ ՂՆ ՔԵՐՈՕՅ ԵՏԴՆԱՅ.

22b 72. ՆԵՇՈՂՆԻՏ ՔԵ ՆՔԵՅՈՒ ՆՔՇՆԱՅ ՆՔՇԱՅՅԱՏՈՆ. ԼԻՕՂԱԸ ՅՈԿ | ԾԱ ՆՈՕՂ-  
 ԱԻ ՔԵՃԱԳ ՈՂ ԶԵ ՇՅԵՆԻԿՆԴ ՆՔՆԱՅ ՆՐԱՏԵ ԶՂՈ ԶՈԿ ԴՆԱՐԱՐԱԴԻՈՅ ՆՈՉ  
 ՆԻՏՆ. 73. ԵՏԵ ՆՈՕՂԱԻ ՔԵՃԱՅ ՆՈՕՂԱԸ ԶԵ ԵՆՆԱՄԱՂԵ ՆՈՉ ՆՂՈ ՆՂԵ ՆԵԳ-  
 ՓՐՈՔ ԶՆ ՂՆ ՕՂՄՐՓՆ ՆՈՂՈՒ ԼԼԱ ԵԳՔՈՐՈՆԵ ՂՆ ՔԵԳԵԻՄԵ. ՂՆՇՈՔ ԵԳՈ ՆՆԵՐԾ

66. Judas, then, listened to his wicked wife. He went to the chief priests and said to them: 'What are you willing to pay me that I deliver him to you?'<sup>83</sup> For I know that you are seeking to kill him. You have not been able to do anything against him, but if you want I am the man who will deliver him to you.' And they made an arrangement with him for 30 silver pieces. He departed from them and went to Jesus and all the apostles, as if there was nothing wrong at all.

67. Then Jesus said to his disciples: 'You know that tomorrow is the day of Israel's release from Egypt, which is the first day of the month of Parmoute,<sup>84</sup> and behold, it is the Sabbath. 68. And the Lord has commanded Moses on Mount Sinai, saying:<sup>85</sup> "Speak to the children of Israel, saying: 'On this day, on which the Lord has brought you out of the land of Egypt,<sup>86</sup> you shall be pure for seven days, and another seven days you shall eat unleavened bread. After that you shall take a fair lamb without any blemish, and you shall slaughter it and roast it on a fire,'"<sup>87</sup> and the rest of the words which God said to Moses. He, then, in his turn wrote down the law and gave it to the people and they do this to the present day.' 69. Therefore, arise now and let us go to the feast of the Passover, in order that the people will not regard us as opposed to the law, for I am from the tribe of Judah. 70. And there is something in my heart which I want to tell you. And when I say it to you, you will be grieved as Mary, my beloved mother, was grieved, but on the other hand, when I do not tell you you will regard me as unknowing. But behold, someone here is a devil.'<sup>88</sup>

71. Then Jesus went to Jerusalem and the apostles followed him, and also Judas. That day was the first of the month of Parmoute.<sup>89</sup> Judas spoke with the Jews guilefully and the Jews paid him an advance on that day.

72. It was the tenth day of the month, the second day of the week. Judas went to the Jews and said to them: 'Prepare yourselves at this hour tomorrow and I shall deliver him to you.' 73. Then the Jews said to Judas: 'How shall we arrest him, for he does not have a single shape but his appearance

---

<sup>83</sup> Matthew 26:15, where the 30 silver pieces are also mentioned.

<sup>84</sup> See note 89 below.

<sup>85</sup> The following is not a real quotation from Scripture but an inaccurate summary of biblical paschal regulations. The ritual purity of seven days before the feast of the Passover is not mentioned in this connection (but see Numbers 9:6 ff.); the unleavened bread was not eaten before the paschal meal (Exodus 12:15 ff.; 23:15; 34:18; Num. 28:17; Deuteronomy 16:3 ff., 8).

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Exodus 12:17 and 50–51.

<sup>87</sup> Exodus 12:8.

<sup>88</sup> John 6:70.

<sup>89</sup> For the chronology, see pp. 42–43.



23a շնօք եօ (նօղօք)<sup>a</sup> շնօք Եղթեփրօք օղօք նաղան նօղօ օղօք եօղօտ-  
օղօտ նօ ննետակե օղօք նշրփր օղօք նշլօ օղօք Երեքեքօ օղօ Եգնիմ |  
օղօք եօ նկարօց օղօք եղչօց օղօք եօ նկօլօվօց. շաղօց նփեննալ Երօ  
ենշ շն օղօնե նօղօտ.

74. աղօղօք նօ Եղչօց քեչօք ննարխիքօց չե քօղն նտեղնի նա նփե-  
քեքե ննշօնիտ աղ անօք ինտանօղն Եղօվ նիմ. տեղնօղն ցար չե Եմիտե  
քեքնի նփրօնե քեքլալ Եղչօք Եղօղօց չե մի լալ նօղնօ օղն նփեք-  
նօց. 75. տօք նօղօլ աղ նա նփքեքե ննշօնիտ աղ աղտանօղ Եօ Ետեքնա-  
23b քարալօղ նօղ նա աղ (քեչօք նալ)<sup>b</sup> | չե շրա շն քաքե քօղն նշօղ նփօլ  
քե. ինտանօղ Եղթօղն նշնաթալ շօղ նօ նփալօց տիղ աղ նալ Ետօլ  
Ելօլ Եքիքօլ. լօլօն օղօք նշնօղօք նփօղնիկօն Ենանօղօլ Եղօլ չե օղն շօլնե  
շն քեքնաթիտ Եղնփօղնարիտ նե աղ օղօք նշնկանալա Ենանօղօլ. Եղն  
աղօղօց Երօ չփեննալ Երօ ենշ շն օղմօղն նօղօտ քալ քե քնալն Եղնա-  
24a լալ ննետնաղչօղ նօլ քեղնալ ք Երօ քաղն Երօ | լալօց նալ չե քալք  
շքալքե նօղ քե աղչօք նօղ.

76. նփքքչե նա լե ննօղօլ աղքե նփքքեքե ննշօնիտ աղօղ Եքքնի  
աղչօք նփքքչիք Եթօղ. քեչօք նա չե Ել քաղ նալօղ նփալալ. տօք  
ալքալք Եմաք քեչօք նալ չե կալօց ալք Եղօղն նա նփօղ Երեթօղն քե նշօղ  
Ենշօղ տիղ. աղնօց Եղանօղն նօլ ինտրեկ նփեքնալա աղ քեթրօց  
մի լալնիք Եղն նալօղօց տիղ.

24b 77. տօք ինտ քեչօք ննքնաթիտ չե օղնալ | աղնօց օղն օղօք շն քալն  
Եղօղ Ելօղ Երօղն աղալ ալք քալնփօղքե նօղն չե օղն քնօն նօլ  
Ենօղն Եղօվ նիմ Եղն Ելալ աղ ինտն ննետնաղք Եղն նալօղօղք.  
քօղն նփղնի Եքալօղ.

78. նփքքնալ լե աղօղ տիղ կիմ շալն. աղք շօք անօղն աղալ  
Եքօղն նօ նօղօղօց նկալ աղ քեքնօղօղն շլալ քօղ նփնալ

<sup>a</sup> M նօղօք. <sup>b</sup> M omits these words.

changes.<sup>90</sup> Sometimes he is ruddy, sometimes he is white, sometimes he is red, sometimes he is wheat-coloured, sometimes he is pallid like ascetics, sometimes he is a youth, sometimes an old man, sometimes his hair is straight and black, sometimes it is curled, sometimes he is tall, sometimes he is short. In one word, we have never seen him in one and the same appearance.'

74. Judas answered and said to the chief priests: 'Come, pay me the rest of the money and I shall tell you everything. For you know that except for this man's friend nobody is able to deliver him up to affliction, because no stranger knows his manner of life.' 75. Then the Jews paid him the rest of the money and he told them the way he would deliver him to them and (he said to them): 'Tomorrow is the first day of the feast. Jesus will make preparations to eat the unleavened bread, too, like all of the people, and it is for this reason that he has come to the city. Therefore, prepare good weapons, for there are some among his disciples who are outstanding warriors, and prepare good torches.<sup>91</sup> Since you said to me: "We have never seen him in a single shape," this is the sign which I shall give to those who will follow me: He whom I shall kiss on his mouth and embrace and to whom I shall say: "Hail rabbi!," he is your man. Arrest him!'<sup>92</sup>

76. As he, then, had said this to the Jews, he took the rest of the money, went to his home and gave it to his wicked wife. He said to her: 'Behold, the total of the price of my master!' Then she was very pleased and said to him: 'Excellent that you came home today with a better result than on all (other) days. In truth, when you listen to me, I shall make you deliver Mary too, and Peter and John, and then all the apostles.'

77. Then Jesus said to his disciples: 'Oh my brethren, in truth, there is something in my heart which I want to tell you. But come, let me assure you that I am able to escape from everything which is about to befall me and that I know the things that will happen before they do happen. Arise, and let us pray to my Father.'

78. When we, then, prayed, the whole mountain shook beneath us.<sup>93</sup> We were afraid and looked and saw the Saviour like a column of fire, and his feet

<sup>90</sup> For the polymorphy of Christ and an explanation of this passage, see pp. 54–56, 59–62.

<sup>91</sup> Weapons and torches are mentioned in John 18:3, in the story of the arrest of Jesus (cf. also Matthew 26:47 and Mark 14:43: swords and cudgels). In the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum*, 21, Judas says to the chief priests and the elders (transl. Vööbus, CSCO 408, 197): 'Make ready young men armed, because of his disciples.'

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Matthew 26:48; Mark 14:44. 'Hail rabbi!' comes from Matthew 26:49.

<sup>93</sup> For this paragraph, see pp. 51–52.



were with us on the mountain but his head reached to the sky, and he was entirely of fire. And we were like the dead, our whole body trembled and we did not know what happened. 79. Afterwards the Saviour raised all of us, who were like the dead, and we saw him in the shape of his humanity, whereas his invisibility, which actually is his divinity, was hidden within him. Then our Saviour released us from our fear, and spoke with us about what would happen to us and about how we would preach.

80. Again he began to be grieved and to be gloomy of heart and he said to them: 'I have longed with desire to eat this passover with you before I die.<sup>94</sup> Oh my brethren, I bid you farewell, for yet a little while I am with you and yet a little while you see me;<sup>95</sup> yet a little while until you are grieved and weep, and again a little while until you laugh.<sup>96</sup> For as to me, I am a stranger to this world, I have come to those who are mine, who are in the world until I redeem them.'<sup>97</sup>

81. As Jesus, then, had said this, he went out with his disciples across the brook Kedron, where there was a garden which he entered with his disciples. But Judas also knew that place because Jesus had often met there with his disciples,<sup>98</sup> and he knew that Peter and John had prepared the passover there so that he might eat it with his disciples.<sup>99</sup>

82. As it, then, had become evening on the third day of the week, the eleventh of the month and the eleventh of the moon, when the day of the moon coincided with the day of the month,<sup>100</sup> and as they ate, Jesus took a bread, blessed it, and said to them: 'Take it and eat of it.'<sup>101</sup> And in the same way,<sup>102</sup> he also took a cup, mingled it and gave it to them, saying: 'Take it and

---

<sup>94</sup> Luke 22:15.

<sup>95</sup> John 13:33 and 16, 16 (cf. also John 14, 19).

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Luke 6:21.

<sup>97</sup> John 6:38–39; 13:1; 16:28 (cf. 1:11).

<sup>98</sup> John 18:1–2.

<sup>99</sup> The tradition that the Last Supper was held in the valley of Josaphat, which in Christian times was erroneously identified with the ravine of the brook Kedron, more specifically in the house where Mary lived until her death, is already found in Theodosius (ca. 530), *De situ Terrae Sanctae*, 10 (CCL 175, 119). Theodosius saw the basilica and the tomb of Mary in the valley, and reports: 'Ibi et Dominus lavit pedes discipulorum, ibi et cenavit;' also Antoninus (or: Anonymus) of Piacenza (ca. 570) *Itinerarium*, 17 (CCL 175, 137). Pseudo-Cyril also assumed that Mary continued to live in this place later on: Jesus leaves her 'in the garden where they had eaten the passover' (§ 86).

<sup>100</sup> See also § 4 and p. 42.

<sup>101</sup> Matthew 26:26.

<sup>102</sup> Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25.



drink of it, all of you.<sup>103</sup> 83. And as they ate he said to them: 'In this night all of you will fall into sin because of me.<sup>104</sup> Oh, behold, my soul is grieved to death.'<sup>105</sup>

84. As he, then, had said this, he said to his disciples: 'Arise, let us go out of this place, for behold, the dragon has mingled a cup of poison,<sup>106</sup> he has given it to the children of Israel and has induced them to seek to kill me.' Then Jesus took the eleven and went out to the mountain.<sup>107</sup>

85. Judas, for his part, took swords and torches<sup>108</sup> and went out at the great hour<sup>109</sup> and withdrew from the crowd in order to go to the garden.

86. But Jesus knew the hearts of the Jews and saw that the disciples were afraid, and he also knew that Judas would seek to deliver up Mary, too, and receive her price. For that reason he did not take her with him to the mountain but left her in the garden where they had eaten the passover. 87. You know that I said a little earlier<sup>110</sup> that Judas' wife had told him: 'I shall make you deliver Mary too, and all the apostles.' But Jesus knew the heart of everyone, and left Mary hidden.

88. He took the apostles, went out to the mountain, left them sleeping, went away, prayed, came back to them and found them asleep with grief. He said to them: 'Arise, pray that you may not come into temptation.'<sup>111</sup> 89. Jesus, then, knew that his hour had come, that he would go away from here and go to the Father.<sup>112</sup> He withdrew a little from the apostles.<sup>113</sup>

90. Judas, then, came with the crowd. He stopped in embarrassment at the head of the crowd. Jesus said: 'Friend, do what you have come for!'<sup>114</sup> Judas kissed him guilefully.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>103</sup> Matthew 26:27; 'mingled it' is an uncanonical addition.

<sup>104</sup> Matthew 26:31.

<sup>105</sup> Matthew 26:38; Mark 14:34.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *Sahidic Fragment* IV, 14, in Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, 177: 'Now our Lord Jesus knew all the things that were coming upon him, and he said to his disciples, My Brethren, behold, the devil has mingled for himself a cup of guile, that I should be crucified.'

<sup>107</sup> Matthew 26:30; Mark 14:26; Luke 22:39.

<sup>108</sup> The swords are mentioned in Matthew 26:47 and Mark 14:43, the torches in John 18:3 (see also § 75).

<sup>109</sup> Probably the hour at which the passover was eaten (cf. Luke 22:14).

<sup>110</sup> In § 76.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Matthew 26:36–46; Mark 14:32–42; Luke 22:40–46.

<sup>112</sup> John 13:1.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Matthew 26:39; Mark 14:35. The story of Jesus' struggle in Gethsemane is (deliberately?) omitted.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Matthew 26:50.

<sup>115</sup> Matthew 26:49; Mark 14:45.

91. τότε ἰς πεχαυ ἡιογδας χε ρῆ οὔπιν εκναῖ ἡπωηρε ἡπρωμε. οντωс  
 наноус наκ енеῖпоуχпок ἡρογο епентакаау. μη ἡῖσοογн аη ἡнетρῆ πεк-  
 ρηт χιν еμпау ἡтакоуаεῖ ἡсωι χῆтоκ οὔπροδοthс аλλα ἡтаianixе ἡмоκ  
 φαντετεκρaη ει наκ каκωс. μη ἡῖсоογн аη ἡпау ἡтаквωк φa ἡархiereус  
 28b ακσῆтс ἡῖнау етаат епмоу ρa маав ἡрат. 92. ω οὔοι наκ ρῆ οὔοι еркнв ω  
 иογδας πεпротоthс аγω πατωпe атекρaη ει наκ | каκωс. ω иογδας екнамоу  
 ἡοуеω ἡωωне ἡнепексωма ἡпωa ἡοукаice ἡнетекῖγхη мооφe ρῆ ποуоеиη  
 аλλα ρῆ пкаке. ἡнеγῖ πεκραη еρωме φa енеε. ерωaηεῖρωме ῖ πεкраη енеγ-  
 ωηре ἡнеγωηεῖ аλλα еγнаωωпе еγсροуорт ἡпаῖто евол φa φомте ἡгeнeа.  
 93. ειсρнηте сeнатaлoι епωe ἡχῖсо ἡтнос ἡпараскеγн ἡтнос ἡεβдомас  
 29a ἡппасха. ἡтоκ де ρωωк екнаоbтῖ ρῆ οὔαλω ἡгаωтῖ еγ|ωηη χe мepixнс.  
 94. аγω ἡηeηa таροκ ρa пeнтaкаау аλλα ерeтeккoлaсic φωпе ескнв ерок  
 ἡнепеккωεῖт χeηa οὔде ἡнепеквῆт моу еγвaсaηize ἡмоκ. ω иογδας οὔнос  
 пе πεкρε. 95. аγω οη атексρime ρaφe χe акқи ἡтааsoу еρογн нас. астамок  
 χe каλωс акеи мῆ таsoу ἡпексаε. ἡнесωηεῖ еоγωη евол ρῆ тагimη аλλα  
 снар пωоу ἡκλω(η)<sup>a</sup> \*ετεπελsoι<sup>\*b</sup> пе ἡсωбт етесωоуωве ἡтeпeсma ἡρmoос

<sup>a</sup>М ἡκλω.<sup>b</sup>Meaning unknown, see note to translation.

91. Then Jesus said to Judas: 'Would you deliver the Son of Man with a kiss?'<sup>116</sup> Really, it would have been better for you not to have been born than to have done this.<sup>117</sup> Do I not know what is in your heart from the time that you followed me, namely that you are a traitor? But I have endured you until your end comes to you badly. Do I not know the hour you went to the chief priests and made an arrangement with them to hand me over to death for thirty silver pieces? 92. Oh, woe to you with a twofold woe,<sup>118</sup> oh Judas, traitor and shameless one, your end has come for you badly. Oh Judas, you will die without sickness, your body will not be worthy a burial, your soul will not walk in the light but in the darkness. Your name will not be given to anyone into eternity. When people give your name to their sons, they will not live but will be cursed before me for three generations. 93. Behold, they will put me on the wood at the sixth hour of Great Preparation Day of the Great Week of the Pascha.<sup>119</sup> But you will throttle yourself with a snare and you will hang yourself on a tree,<sup>120</sup> namely a tamarisk. 94. And there will be no mercy for you because of what you have done, but your punishment will be twofold: your fire will not be quenched nor will your worm die when you are tortured. Oh Judas, great is your fall. 95. And your wife in her turn was pleased because you brought her my price. She told you: "Excellent that you have come with the price of your master."<sup>121</sup> She will not live to eat from my price but she will get the burning diarrhoea which is the ... (?),<sup>122</sup> her throat will be throttled,

<sup>116</sup> Luke 22:48. A similar lengthy rebuke of Judas, this time addressed to him not by Jesus himself but by the preacher, is found in Ps.-Cyril, *On the Resurrection and the Passion*, Pierpont Morgan Library Codex M595, fol. 7<sup>vo</sup> (p. 14), b7 – fol. 8<sup>vo</sup> (p. 16), a7; see p. 84 above.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Matthew 26:24; Mark 14:21.

<sup>118</sup> The same expression is used by Jesus against Judas in *The Book of the Resurrection of Christ, by Bartholomew the Apostle*, 17 (ed. Westerhoff, *Auferstehung und Jenseits*, 80/81): ἵτοκ ζωακ ογοι νακ ζην ογοι εφκην.

<sup>119</sup> 'Great Preparation Day' = ἡ μεγάλη παρασκευή (= Good Friday), cf. Lampe, *Lexicon*, 1025b s.v. παρασκευή 3.e.; for this and 'the Great Week of the Pascha,' see pp. 2–3. Typically Christian expressions are here put into Jesus' mouth.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Matthew 27:5; Acts 1:18.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. § 76.

<sup>122</sup> The translation is very uncertain; the text is most probably corrupt. The obscure meaning of the words συναρ πωρογ ἡκλω ετεπελσοι πε was already noted by Crum, *Dictionary*, 601a, s.v. πωρογ, 102b, s.v. κλω, and 59b, s.v. ερσοι. I suggest to take πωρογ as a form of πωρογ, 'flow, pour, discharge' (Crum, *Dictionary*, 602; cf. also 158b: ρ πωρογ μη, 'to have (abnormal) flow of urine, or? diarrhoea, dysentery') and κλω as κλωη, the Faiyunic form of Sahidic κρωη, 'fire,' as adjective 'of fire, fiery' (Crum, *Dictionary*, 115b–116a, who, however, suggest a connection with κλω, some kind of 'poison,' 102b). The meaning of the word ελσοι or ερσοι in ετεπελσοι πε is also uncertain: in a recipe for eye disease mention is made of the bitterness of ερσοι (Crum, *Dictionary*, 59b).



- 29b ταγε βñт εβολ ñσμογ ñπναγ | ñχπñτε ñπειροογ ñογωт ετεπсавбатон πε. 96.  
 αγω και τηρογ εγναωωπε ñнок ωα πναγ ñχπñτε ñпсавбатон зñ πναγ δε  
 ñποοειν ñткγριακн ετεταанаσταςис τε πεqтоογ ñкоοг ñпекнн натωт εβολ  
 мñ пкаг. ñтекеога хи ñтекмñтапостолос ñqтаωе оеиω мññса тпентекостн.  
 97. ω ιογΔας ογοи наκ ογп ñкроq те ñтактаас етатапро ñпооγ ωантекqи  
 30a ñпаспасмос ñтоотоγ ñнетфореи ñпаран. | ω тειειрннн ñтактаас και зñ  
 ογкроq актреγqеи ñтрннн ñпкосмос зñ ñειροογ теронпе.

98. και δε ñтереqχοογ ñβι ις ñιογΔας ñσμελει наq ан золωс αλλα αqκн  
 εñιογΔαι αγωωπε ñис агñтq̄ ератq̄ ñпархιερεγс. αñнаонтнс ř зоте агпωт  
 агкааq.

99. αογα δε εβολ зñ ñεqμαонтнс εγñскн πε ñθερнос тωкñ ñтеqснqе  
 αqρωгт ñογгñгал епапархιερεγс πε. зñ пхоγq ñπεqгнт εзоγн епехс αqογωω  
 30b εqеи ñтаπε ñггñгал. 100. ñтаqř | пай ñβι петрос еγΔιατροпн ñпархιερεγс.  
 ара мñ ρоме зñ пнннqе ñса пай. зе пexаq αλλα еиωанпатассе ñпай еио ñθе  
 еωхе ñтапатассе ñπεqχοеис εβολ хе qωпнe ñса моγογт ñис ñρογο епкесееπε

and her anus will excrete worms, and she will die at the ninth hour of that same day,<sup>123</sup> which is the Sabbath. 96. All these things will happen to you at the time of the ninth hour of the Sabbath, but at dawn of the Lord's day, which is that of my resurrection, the four corners of your house will be leveled to the ground. And another one will receive your apostleship and he will preach after Pentecost.<sup>124</sup> 97. Oh Judas, woe unto you, it is a guileful kiss you gave me on my mouth today, so that you take away the kiss of peace from those who bear my name. Oh this kiss of peace you guilefully gave me! You have made that the peace of the world is taken away from these days each year!<sup>125</sup>

98. As Jesus, then, said this to Judas, he (Judas) did not care at all but made a sign to the Jews and they arrested Jesus and brought him to the High Priest. The disciples were afraid, they fled and left him.<sup>126</sup>

99. But one of his disciples, who was a hotheaded, grey-haired man,<sup>127</sup> drew his sword and struck at a servant who belonged to the High Priest.<sup>128</sup> In his ardent feeling for Christ he wanted to behead the servant. 100. Peter did so in order to make the servant a substitute for the High Priest. Was there no other in that crowd than this one? 'Yea,' he said, 'but when I strike this one, it is as if I have struck his master, for he seeks to kill Jesus more than

<sup>123</sup> Namely the day on which Judas would hang himself.

<sup>124</sup> Based on Acts 1:15–26; cf. especially the quotation from Ps. 69:26 in vs. 20: 'Let his homestead fall desolate' and from Ps. 109:8: 'Let another take over his charge (ἐπισκοπήν)'. The same allusions to Acts 1:20 in the *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Bartholomew the Apostle*, 18 (ed. Westerhoff, *Auferstehung und Jenseits*, 82/83): 'His episcopate was taken away from him, ... his house was left deserted'; French translation in Kaestli & Cherix, *Évangile de Barthélémy*, 191.

<sup>125</sup> The words used here for 'kiss of peace,' ἀσπασμος and εἰρήνη, are terms for the liturgical kiss of peace at the eucharist (cf. Lampe, *Lexicon*, 246a s.v. ἀσπασμός, and 421a s.v. εἰρήνη K.2). This kiss was omitted on days of fast, in particular during the period from the eve of Good Friday until Easter morning; cf. already Tertullian, *De oratione*, 18. Jesus predicts a posterior liturgical usage!

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Matthew 26:56–57; Mark 14:50 and 53; Luke 22:54; John 18:12. In the Gospels these verses are preceded by the story of the High Priest's servant (Matthew 26:51–54; Mark 14:47; Luke 22:49–51; John 18:10–11), which next follows in Pseudo-Cyril.

<sup>127</sup> Pseudo-Evodius of Rome, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 88 (ed. Chapman, in Depuydt, *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, CSCO 524, 104 [text] and CSCO 525 [translation], 111), also calls Peter, who is the first to enter the tomb of Jesus 'hot-headed (σφοδρικός)': 'for he was a hot-headed man, more than all the apostles.' Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 33 (ed. Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 46/47; see on this text, pp. 77–79 above), calls Peter and John who go to the tomb of Jesus 'two hot-headed men' (πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον). In the *Gospel of Mary*, 18, 7–8, Levi reproaches Peter that he has always been hot-tempered (περηνόγος). In early Christian and Byzantine, as well as Western medieval art, Peter is always represented as a grey-haired or white-haired man.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Mark 14:47; Matthew 26:51–54; Luke 22:49–51; John 18:10–11.

101.  $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\bar{\omicron}\gamma\Delta\alpha\iota$ .  $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon$   $\pi\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\iota\rho$   $\gamma\eta\alpha\iota$   $\epsilon\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\gamma\alpha\lambda$   $\bar{\eta}\rho\omicron\gamma\omicron$   $\epsilon\gamma\mu\eta\eta\eta\upsilon\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\bar{\omicron}\gamma\Delta\alpha\iota$ .  
 101.  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$   $\alpha\pi\epsilon\chi\varsigma$   $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\epsilon\iota$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\iota\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\varsigma$   $\upsilon\epsilon\iota$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\bar{\eta}\gamma\alpha\lambda$   $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$   $\alpha\tau\varsigma\eta\upsilon\epsilon$   
 31a  $\bar{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon^a$   $\epsilon\iota$   $\epsilon\chi\bar{\eta}$   $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\alpha\chi\epsilon$   $\alpha\upsilon\varsigma\omicron\lambda\pi\bar{\eta}$ .  $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\chi\varsigma$   $\omicron\gamma\omega\omega$   $\epsilon\tau\bar{\rho}\epsilon\pi\gamma\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\varsigma$   $\pi\epsilon\bar{\rho}\tau$   
 $\varsigma\eta\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda$  |  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\tau$   $\pi\bar{\rho}\eta\tau$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\alpha\pi\omicron\varsigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\langle\phi\omicron\eta\omicron\varsigma\rangle^b$   $\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$   
 $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda$   $\gamma\iota\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\bar{\eta}$ .

102.  $\tau\epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\varsigma\omicron\omicron\gamma\eta$   $\omega$   $\kappa\alpha\omega\eta\bar{\rho}\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\mu\epsilon\bar{\rho}\iota\tau$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$   $\langle\phi\omicron\eta\omicron\varsigma\rangle^c$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$   $\alpha\eta\alpha\gamma$   
 $\epsilon\pi\bar{\rho}\iota\epsilon\rho\omicron\phi\alpha\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\mu\omega\gamma\varsigma\eta\varsigma$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\omega\bar{\rho}\tau$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\kappa}\eta\mu\epsilon$   $\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\upsilon\bar{\rho}\alpha\bar{\gamma}\tau\bar{\eta}$   $\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$   
 $\bar{\eta}\chi\alpha\bar{\rho}\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\mu\omicron\gamma$ .  $\omega\chi\epsilon$   $\omicron\gamma\eta\bar{\rho}$   $\bar{\eta}\varsigma\omicron\pi$   $\alpha\pi\Delta\iota\alpha\upsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\chi\iota$   $\gamma\alpha\pi$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$   $\pi\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\gamma\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon$   
 31b  $\pi\epsilon\iota\bar{\rho}\omega\upsilon$   $\alpha\gamma\omega$   $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\pi\Delta\iota\alpha\upsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\mu\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$   $\epsilon\bar{\rho}\omicron\gamma$   $\omega\alpha$   $\pi\omicron\omicron\gamma$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\omega\tau\bar{\upsilon}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\pi\epsilon\bar{\rho}$   
 $\omicron\gamma\varsigma\eta\upsilon\epsilon$   $\alpha\eta$   $\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\bar{\rho}\alpha\bar{\gamma}\tau\bar{\eta}$   $\bar{\eta}\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$  |  $\omicron\gamma\langle\pi\rangle\alpha\pi\eta\bar{\rho}^d$   $\tau\epsilon$ . 103.  $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon$   $\pi\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\pi\epsilon\chi\varsigma$   
 $\tau\bar{\rho}\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\varsigma$   $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omicron$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$   $\epsilon\upsilon\omega\gamma\omicron\epsilon\iota\tau$   $\omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon$   $\omicron\eta$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\bar{\rho}\tau$   $\varsigma\eta\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\lambda$ .  
 $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon$   $\pi\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\pi\epsilon\chi\varsigma$   $\chi\omicron\omicron\varsigma$   $\eta\alpha\upsilon$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\eta\omicron\gamma\chi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\kappa\varsigma\eta\upsilon\epsilon$   $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\varsigma\kappa\omicron\iota\bar{\rho}$   $\omicron\gamma\omicron\eta$   $\gamma\alpha\rho$   $\eta\eta\mu$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\gamma\chi\iota$   
 $\varsigma\eta\upsilon\epsilon$   $\varsigma\epsilon\eta\alpha\bar{\rho}\omicron\tau\upsilon\omicron\gamma$   $\gamma\bar{\eta}$   $\tau\varsigma\eta\upsilon\epsilon$ .

104.  $\alpha\gamma\omega$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\gamma\eta\omicron\gamma$   $\delta\gamma\alpha\mu\alpha\bar{\gamma}\tau\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\varsigma$   $\alpha\gamma\bar{\eta}\tau\bar{\eta}$   $\epsilon\bar{\rho}\alpha\tau\bar{\eta}$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ .  $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\eta\alpha\gamma$   $\Delta\epsilon$   
 $\epsilon\bar{\rho}\omicron\gamma$   $\alpha\upsilon\bar{\rho}\alpha\omega\epsilon$   $\epsilon\eta\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$ .  $\eta\epsilon\chi\bar{\iota}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\tau\epsilon$   $\Delta\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\gamma\omega\eta$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\omega\omega\eta\bar{\eta}\tau$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\varsigma\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\eta$   $\pi\epsilon$   $\alpha\gamma\omega$   
 32a  $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon\gamma\tau\omicron\omicron\gamma\epsilon$   $\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\omega\omega\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\gamma$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\varsigma\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\eta$   $\alpha\bar{\iota}\varsigma$   $\alpha\bar{\rho}\epsilon\bar{\rho}\alpha\tau\bar{\eta}$  |  $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\bar{\iota}\phi\alpha\varsigma$ . 105.  
 $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$   $\pi\alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$   $\pi\epsilon\chi\alpha\upsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\varsigma$   $\gamma\bar{\eta}$   $\omicron\gamma\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\tau\chi\alpha\varsigma\iota\bar{\rho}\eta\tau$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\omicron\kappa$   $\pi\epsilon$   $\omega\omega\eta\bar{\rho}\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\pi\eta\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ .  
 $\pi\epsilon\chi\epsilon$   $\bar{\iota}\varsigma$   $\eta\alpha\upsilon$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\omicron\kappa$   $\pi\epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\kappa\chi\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ .  $\alpha\upsilon\omicron\gamma\omega\omega\bar{\upsilon}$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$   $\pi\alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\dagger\tau\alpha\rho\kappa\omicron$   $\bar{\eta}\mu\omicron\kappa$   
 $\bar{\eta}\pi\eta\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\bar{\eta}\mu\omega\gamma\varsigma\eta\varsigma$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\chi\epsilon$   $\tau\eta\epsilon$   $\eta\alpha\iota$ .  $\alpha\upsilon\omicron\gamma\omega\omega\bar{\upsilon}$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\alpha\eta\omicron\kappa$   $\pi\epsilon$ .  $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$   
 $\pi\alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\pi\epsilon\bar{\rho}$   $\eta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon$   $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omega$   $\bar{\eta}\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\alpha\upsilon\chi\iota$   $\omicron\gamma\alpha$ .

106.  $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\alpha\upsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\omega\bar{\eta}\mu\omicron$   $\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\bar{\gamma}\iota\varsigma$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\tau\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\upsilon$   $\gamma\bar{\eta}$   $\pi\tau\bar{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\omega\bar{\rho}$   $\bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon$ .  $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\eta\bar{\rho}$   
 $\gamma\alpha\rho$   $\gamma\bar{\eta}$   $\pi\eta\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\bar{\eta}\mu\omega\gamma\varsigma\eta\varsigma$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\alpha\gamma$   $\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\upsilon$   $\dagger$   $\gamma\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon$   $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\eta\bar{\rho}$   $\gamma\iota\omega\omega\upsilon$ .  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$   
 32b  $\epsilon\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}$  |  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\bar{\rho}\omega\alpha\eta\pi\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\upsilon$   $\gamma\epsilon$   $\gamma\bar{\eta}$   $\omicron\gamma\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\tau\omega\eta\alpha$   $\epsilon\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$   $\mu\epsilon\eta$   $\omega\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\alpha\upsilon$   $\gamma\bar{\eta}$   
 $\lambda\alpha\alpha\gamma$   $\bar{\eta}\beta\alpha\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\eta\epsilon\gamma\pi\epsilon\bar{\rho}$   $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon$   $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$   $\epsilon\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$   $\alpha\upsilon\bar{\rho}\epsilon$   $\alpha\gamma\omega$   $\eta\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\alpha\upsilon$   $\gamma\bar{\eta}$   $\lambda\alpha\alpha\gamma$   
 $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\chi\eta\eta$   $\omega\alpha\gamma\pi\epsilon\bar{\rho}$   $\eta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon$   $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\varsigma\eta\tau$   $\omega\alpha$   $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\mu\epsilon\varsigma\tau\bar{\rho}\eta\tau$   $\bar{\eta}\varsigma\epsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\varsigma$   $\chi\epsilon$   $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\pi\bar{\chi}\varsigma$   $\upsilon\iota$   $\bar{\eta}\mu\alpha\gamma$

<sup>a</sup>The position of  $\bar{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$  between subject and verb is very irregular, which may be due to an error of the scribe; one would expect the word after  $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\alpha\chi\epsilon$ .

<sup>b</sup>  $\bar{\eta}\pi\epsilon\phi\omicron\eta\omicron\varsigma$ .

<sup>c</sup>  $\bar{\eta}\phi\omicron\eta\omicron\varsigma$ . <sup>d</sup>  $\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\bar{\rho}$ ; or read  $\omicron\gamma\langle\pi\rangle\alpha\pi\eta\bar{\rho}\langle\omicron\rangle?$ ; see p. 67, n. 179.

the rest of the Jews. For this reason, I desired to strike his servant more than a great many of the Jews.' 101. But Christ disposed in this way: Peter did not take the head of the servant, but the sword only came upon his ear and cut it off. Christ did not want Saint Peter to shed blood<sup>129</sup> but he obliged the desire of the apostle: he struck, but he did not commit murder.

102. You know, oh my beloved sons, that no murder occurred in this fight. But look at the hierophant Moses: when he struck the Egyptian<sup>130</sup> he actually struck him with a papyrus scroll, and he died. How many times the devil has quarrelled with the archangel about this event, and, behold, until the present day the devil calls him the prophet-killer, although it is not with a sword that he struck him but with a papyrus.<sup>131</sup> 103. Therefore, Christ made Peter hit his shoulder:<sup>132</sup> he did not act in vain, nor, on the other hand, did he shed blood. Therefore, Christ said to him: 'Put your sword into its sheath, for all who take the sword will be killed by the sword.'<sup>133</sup>

104. And immediately they seized Jesus and brought him to the High Priest. As he, then, saw him, he was very pleased. It was the ninth hour of the night of the third day of the week. And at dawn, early on the fourth day of the week, Jesus stood before Caiaphas.<sup>134</sup> 105. Then the High Priest highheartedly said to Jesus: 'Are you the Son of God?' Jesus said to him: 'You have said so.'<sup>135</sup> The High Priest answered: 'I adjure you by the law of Moses to speak the truth to me!' Jesus answered: 'I am.'<sup>136</sup> Then the High Priest tore his clothes saying: 'He has spoken blasphemy.'<sup>137</sup>

106. He estranged himself from the order of the priesthood by tearing his clothes. For it is written in the law of Moses: 'No priest shall clothe himself in a torn garment.'<sup>138</sup> But whenever the priest falls into a sin (there are two possibilities): when they (the Jews) allow him to remain in a hierarchical position, they do not tear his clothes, but when he has fallen and they do not retain him in any function, they tear his clothes down to his breast and

<sup>129</sup> This is apparently taken here as an equivalent of 'to kill.'

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Exodus 2:12.

<sup>131</sup> For this tradition and the word ἀνῆρ, see pp. 65–67.

<sup>132</sup> The word σο means 'arm-pit' (Crum, *Dictionary*, 753b s.v.), but also 'shoulder'; see W. Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1977, 412 s.v.; or read ἡνέχσοκ, 'his hair,' or ἡνέχο, 'his face'?

<sup>133</sup> Matthew 26:52.

<sup>134</sup> For this chronology of Holy Week, see pp. 45–46.

<sup>135</sup> Matthew 26:63–64.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. Mark 14:62 and Matthew 26:63: 'I adjure you by the living God.'

<sup>137</sup> Matthew 26:65.

<sup>138</sup> Leviticus 10:6 and 21:10: 'The high priest, ..., shall neither leave his hair dishevelled nor tear his clothes.'

ἡπεφθεοὺ γιχῆ πσατanas τενοῦ σε φκнк δzhγ ἡπεοὺ ἡτμῆτογῆнв. αἰω  
ἡτεγνοῦ ωαγῆoxῆ εβολ αxen λααῦ ἡβαθнос <ἡ>εβραικον.

33a 107. ται τε текρε ζωωк ω καιφας χιν θε ἡтакπεг некзоите акр ωῆмо еπεхс  
| етве текпрогаirecic εθοοῦ αἰω текмῆтархнепскопос аker ωῆмо ерос зῆ  
παιων мῆ петннγ.

33b 108. ογνος πε πzhве етпорω нан εβολ ἡпооῦ ω намерате. eis ογνος  
гар ἡнаγ †гомеlei ἡῆнτῆ зῆ ἡθγснос ἡῆапостолос ωα τεноῦ ἡтеперп-  
мееγe ἡпооῦ ei етннте етепeгтооῦ пе ἡпсаббатон перооῦ ἡтаγμαδzte ἡic  
ἡзнтῆ αἰ† zice наq. αλλα μαρεнxe зῆкоγi еρωτῆ зῆ nezice ἡпенсωтнr наi  
ἡтаqωo|поῦ зарон етве пенoγxai.

109. ἡтерепетсооq δε етῆмаγ пωz ἡнеqзоите аq[моῦ]те exῆ πнннqе xe  
аqxi ογα ἡтенр x(p)ia<sup>a</sup> аη ἡῆнтре ероq eiеннтει теqтапро ἡмин ἡмоq. αἰω  
ἡтеγνοῦ аῆioγΔai ен тоотoῦ exωq зῆ ογсωнт зoine зῆ зенаас зῆкооγe  
зῆ зенфрагелле зoine зῆ пмоγp ἡнеγтннве ωантеqckoоῦ ἡqze езpai exен  
теqкеzte ἡoγnam ἡпемто εβολ ἡῆархiereγс мῆ ἡioγΔai мῆ пладос тнpῆ.

34a 110. | αλнөс ογνος ἡzhве нан пе пооῦ ω намерате αἰω наωнpe мῆ  
наωεere етсооγz εзоγн еπειна ἡпооῦ етсωтῆ еpoi етаγo ἡзῆкоγi εβολ зῆ

<sup>a</sup> M xia.

say: 'The anointed one<sup>139</sup> has conferred his honour on Satan; therefore, he is stripped of the honour of the priesthood.' And without delay they cast him out without any Hebrew hierarchical rank.<sup>140</sup>

107. This is your position too, oh Caiaphas, from the moment you tore your clothes you have been estranged from the anointed order because of your wicked intention and you have been estranged from your high priesthood<sup>141</sup> in this world and in that to come.

108. Great is the mourning which is spread out for us today, oh my beloved. For already for a long time I have been preaching to you from the *Constitutions of the Apostles*<sup>142</sup> until this moment, now we celebrate the commemoration of today, which is the fourth day of the week, the day on which they arrested Jesus and made him suffer. But let us tell you a few things of the sufferings of our Saviour, which he endured for us because of our salvation.

109. As that defiled man, then, tore his clothes, he cried out to the multitude: "He has spoken blasphemy, we need no other witness than his own mouth."<sup>143</sup> And at once the Jews laid hands on him in anger, some hitting him with slaps in his face, others with scourges, some with their fists,<sup>144</sup> until he became dizzy<sup>145</sup> and fell on his right hip, in the face of the chief priests and the Jews and the whole people.

110. Truly, it is a great mourning for us today, oh my beloved and my sons and my daughters who have gathered together in this place today and who hear me recount a few things of the sufferings which our Saviour has

<sup>139</sup> In Coptic,  $\pi\epsilon\chi\bar{\kappa}$  usually means 'Christ,' but here it indicates the anointed Jewish priest. In § 107, where the same word occurs, the meaning 'Christ' might be intended, but it seems more likely that there, too, the author had the anointed order of the priests in mind.

<sup>140</sup> I have been unable to discover the origin of this tradition. In Pseudo-Evodius of Rome, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 18 (ed. Chapman, in Depuydt, *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, CSCO 524 [text], 84 and CSCO 525 [transl.], 89) the author also remarks that the High Priest's action was against the Law ( $\omicron\upsilon\gamma\tau\alpha\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\omicron$ ), 'for he is not allowed to tear his clothes.' The text continues by saying that Caiaphas had not received his high priesthood from God but for money.

<sup>141</sup> Litt.: 'archiepiscopate.'

<sup>142</sup> Coptic:  $\pi\omicron\gamma\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\bar{\iota}\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  (= Greek:  $\omicron\iota\ \theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omicron\iota\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\omega\nu$ ), see § 154 and p. 13.

<sup>143</sup> Matthew 26:65; Mark 14:65; 'his own mouth' comes from Luke 22:71.

<sup>144</sup> Lit. 'with the clutch of their fingers.' Crum, *Dictionary*, 181b, who quotes this passage, overlooked the  $\omega\mu\epsilon$  before  $\gamma\bar{\eta}\ \pi\eta\omicron\gamma\upsilon\rho$  and understood 'scourges in the clutch of their fingers.' Cf. Matthew 26:67; Mark 14:65. What follows is an uncanonical addition of unknown provenance.

<sup>145</sup> The same expression in Pseudo-Cyril, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 15 (ed. Campagnano, *Omélie copte*, 34/35):  $\pi\epsilon\gamma\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\gamma\ \omicron\eta\ \gamma\alpha\ \pi\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \bar{\eta}\kappa\lambda\gamma\ \bar{\eta}\tau\alpha\gamma\tau\alpha\delta\gamma\ \epsilon\chi\bar{\eta}\ \tau\epsilon\varphi\alpha\pi\epsilon$ , 'and he became dizzy because of the blows with their fists by which they struck his head.'



endured because of us in order to redeem us from our sins. Woe unto me, me, this most humble<sup>146</sup> Cyril: how is it that my fleshly mouth has been able to briefly tell this story, for they have struck my God until he became dizzy and fell. But let us return to the sufferings which our Saviour endured for us.<sup>147</sup>

111. When these things, then, had happened, a very rich man stood up, whose name was Nicodemus and who was the president of the synagogue.<sup>148</sup> He cried out to the High Priest: 'You have done something which exceeds your jurisdiction! Behold, the emperor rules, behold, the governor is in the city. But you judge by yourself a honest man whom many take to be a prophet. Arise, let us bring him to the governor and let him judge him as it pleases him, since we, both you and the multitude, will be unable to lay our hands on him without the command of the governor.'

112. Thereupon the chief priests were afraid when they heard his words, since they knew that he was a great man in the synagogue. They answered: 'We shall act as your highness commands.' And this man, Nicodemus, was the one who went to Jesus and received baptism, about whom we spoke a little earlier. 113. They, however, took Jesus to the governor at the (first) hour<sup>149</sup> of the fourth day of the week, and the name of that governor was Pontius. He was a foreigner by birth, but after he had come to this city he had come to believe in God and had been given an additional name: Pilate.

<sup>146</sup> 'This least' or 'this most humble (ελαχιστος) ...' is the usual self-designation of Coptic preachers (cf. Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, 49 [§ 58 (a)]), probably derived from the apostle Paul, who called himself 'the least (ἐλάχιστος) of the apostles' or 'of all saints' (1 Corinthians 15:9 and Ephesians 3:8). See also § 160 and e.g. Budge, *Coptic Miscellaneous Texts*, 6, 10, 24, 30 48 ('this most humble Theodorus'), De Vis, *Homélies coptes*, II, 126, 131, 164 ('this most humble Theophilus') and 247 ('this most humble Archelaus'), and L. Depuydt (ed.), *Encomiastica from the Pierpont Morgan Library. Five Coptic Homilies Attributed to Anastasius of Euchaita, Epiphanius of Salamis, Isaac of Antioch, Severian of Gabala and Theopompus of Antioch* (CSCO 544 [text]), Louvain: Peeters, 1993, 6,15–16 and 18, 23 ('this most humble Anastasius'), also 15, 31 ('my humbleness [τῆς ὑμεινότητος], I Anastasius').

<sup>147</sup> In the §§ 111–153 Pseudo-Cyril reproduces an apocryphon of the Pilate cycle which is not known from other sources. Its very positive view of Pilate points to an originally Egyptian composition; see also p. 34.

<sup>148</sup> Although he has already been mentioned in §§ 34–45, Nicodemus is introduced here as a new character. He plays a role not recorded in any of the canonical stories of the Passion. At the end of the passage, however, in § 112, Pseudo-Cyril refers to his previous story of Nicodemus' baptism by Jesus (§§ 42–45).

<sup>149</sup> The Ms. reads 'the eleventh hour,' which can only be upheld if the author here followed the Jewish reckoning of the days. As he does not do this elsewhere, however, (see p. 46) it is more probable that this is a scribal error (ἐλένντορε, 'eleventh hour,' instead of ἀπόμε, 'first hour'); see also §§ 120 and 125.



36a 114. ἡτερογεν ἰς δε ναϋ εζογν αϥωωτ̄ ἡσωϥ ἡογνoς ἡναϥ εϥῖ ϥπηρε  
 ἡτεϥἡἡτσαῖε ἡἡ τεϥἡἡτῖρρε. τεϥἡορϥἡ τε ται εϥο ἡἡογνεσoγo ερεπεϥω  
 κἡἡ εϥἡἡϥ επεσἡτ̄ εἡεἡ μεϥἡαζῖ ἡoε ἡἡἡσἡαζ ἡελοoλε ερεϥααντῖ ἡoσε  
 (εϥo)<sup>a</sup> ἡσαἡ ἡβαλ ερενεϥμετἡἡἡαζ<sup>b</sup> τἡς ενεγερἡϥ | ερενεϥoγoσε τρεϥρωϥ  
 ἡoε ἡἡογἡρτ̄ ερεoγἡτἡἡ ἡαγαν<sup>c</sup> ἡελοoλε το ϥωωϥ (ερε)επεἡτἡἡα<sup>d</sup> σἡαϥ  
 ἡαγρογἡλε<sup>e</sup> το ϥωωϥ ϥἡεἡ ϥτἡϥ ἡoε ἡoγσἡαoα ερεoγερἡωἡ ἡωἡς oοoλε  
 ἡἡοϥ εϥεἡε ἡoγἡἡε ἡῖρρo. ται τε oε ἡταγἡτῖ ϥρατῖ ἡἡλατoς ϥἡἡἡωἡ  
 ἡἡἡτ̄.

36b 115. τοτε πἡλατoς πεἡαϥ ἡἡτ̄ ἡἡτοκ oγἡ ἡτοκ ἡτεἡε ἡἡ ἡτοκ πε ἡῖρρo  
 ἡἡἡογἡαι. πεἡε ἡτ̄ ναϥ ἡε ἡτακἡε παἡ ϥαροκ ἡαγaaκ ἡε ϥἡκοoγε ἡἡταγἡooc  
 νακ | ετἡἡἡτ̄. αϥoγἡωἡἡ ἡἡἡ ϥἡἡἡωἡ ἡε πεκἡεoἡoc πoκ ἡτοϥ πετκατοἡκορεἡ  
 ἡἡοκ αἡἡα ἡἡπἡετ̄εγε ναϥ αἡ αἡἡ ἡἡτρε. αϥκελεγε εεἡε ἡἡτ̄ εγἡα ἡαγaaϥ.

116. πεἡαϥ ἡἡἡογἡαι ἡε αἡρἡωἡἡ ἡἡ πεἡερεϥἡε. τοτε ἡἡογἡαι πεἡαϥ ἡἡἡἡ-  
 τoς ἡε εἡεκoοoγἡ ἡἡρἡωἡ ἡἡεἡἡἡἡoς ἡἡἡἡἡἡε ναϥ αἡ ἡκεoγἡoγ ἡoγεϥ  
 ἡoγoγτ̄ ἡἡοϥ. πεἡε πἡλατoς ναϥ ἡε πρoς oε εἡἡναϥ ερoϥ oγἡἡε ἡῖρρo πε αἡωϥ  
 εβoλ τἡρoγ ἡἡἡoἡ.

37a 117. | πεἡε πἡλατoς ναϥ ἡε παaϥ ἡἡoἡἡ πε ϥἡ πετἡἡεoἡoc αϥoγἡωἡἡ ἡε  
 πατἡἡἡἡἡα πε. αϥoγἡωἡἡ ἡε oγἡἡἡἡἡoς πε. ἡἡἡἡoογἡ ἡἡἡρἡἡἡc τaεἡε  
 επεϥβἡoς ἡε oγἡeἡoc ἡoγ πε ἡε εἡε τεϥἡορϥἡ ἡ ϥoτe ἡoε ἡoγἡἡε ἡῖρρo. 118.  
 τοτε αϥἡεἡ ἡἡογἡαι εβoλ αϥἡoγτe εἡτ̄ ϥἡ oγεϥἡἡα πεἡαϥ ναϥ ἡε εἡε ἡἡογἡαι  
 αἡτaἡoἡ ἡἡτ̄k oγe εβoλ ϥἡ τἡἡἡἡἡ. λoἡἡoἡ αἡῖ αἡἡ ετἡἡoοoγἡ ἡἡἡρἡἡἡc  
 37b ἡε ἡἡεκἡooc ἡε εκκἡἡε ἡἡoἡ αἡἡἡoς ϥἡ oγκαἡ | ἡωἡἡo. ἡτ̄ α[ε] ἡἡεϥoγἡω[ἡ]  
 λaaγ.

119. τοτε πἡλατ[oc] αϥσἡἡε ἡ[oγ]ἡαρτἡc α[ϥἡἡαἡ] ερoϥ ἡτεἡ[ἡε] ἡε πoἡτἡoς  
 [πἡ]λατoς εϥἡ[ἡαἡ]<sup>f</sup> ἡἡἡρἡἡἡ[c πἡ]τετἡααρἡ[ἡc] ἡἡτἡἡἡ[ἡαἡ]. επἡἡ ἡτ̄[α]-  
 ἡαρἡερεγ[с] αἡω πἡaoc ἡἡ[ἡ]oγἡαι oἡπε ἡoγἡερεϥἡε αἡπαρἡἡcτa ἡἡοϥ ἡαἡ ἡε

<sup>a</sup>M omits εϥo, which, however, seems necessary in this connection.

<sup>b</sup>For this unusual spelling, see p. 5, n. 19. <sup>c</sup>M ἡαἡαoἡ ἡαγαν. The word ἡαἡαoἡ was most probably a scribal error for ἡαγaaἡ, which the scribe immediately added (in its common Sahidic form: ἡαγαν; see Crum, *Dictionary*, 20), without deleting the wrong word.

<sup>d</sup>M omits ερε, which, however, is necessary in this connection. <sup>e</sup>Probably a distorted form of Greek ἀργυρόηλος, 'silver-studded'; see above p. 63.

<sup>f</sup>For the reconstruction of the text, see the Coptic version of the *Letter of Abgar* in E. Drioton, 'Un apocryphe anti-arien: la version copte de la Correspondence d'Abgar, roi d'Édesse, avec notre Seigneur,' *ROC* 20 (1915–1917) 314: αἡκαροc ἡῖρρo ἡετecca τἡoἡἡ εϥἡἡαἡ ἡἡἡoς ἡῖρρo πἡἡε ἡἡἡoγτe ετoἡἡ ἡτ̄ πεἡτ̄ ἡερε.

114. As, then, they brought Jesus before him, he looked at him for a long time, marveling at his beauty and his youth. This is his appearance:<sup>150</sup> he is corn-coloured, his hair is black, coming down to his shoulders like bunches of grapes, his nose is prominent, he has beautiful eyes, his eyebrows are joined together, his cheeks are red like roses. He wears a grape-coloured tunic, he has two silver-studded<sup>151</sup> adornments on his side, like a sword,<sup>152</sup> and a linen garment covers him so that he looks like a royal son. Thus they brought him to Pilate, the governor.

115. Then Pilate said to Jesus: 'So you, you (dressed) in this manner, you are the king of the Jews?' Jesus said to him: 'Have you said this of your own accord or because others have told you this about me?' The governor answered: 'It is your own people that accuse you, but I do not believe them without a witness.'<sup>153</sup> He commanded that Jesus be taken to a separate place.

116. He said to the Jews: 'What do you have against this young man?' Then the Jews said to Pilate: 'If you knew what this deceiver has done, you would have no patience with him for another hour without killing him.' Pilate said to them: 'As far as I can see he is a royal son' They all cried out: 'No!'

117. Pilate said to them: 'Which city in your nation does he belong to?' They answered: 'He is from Galilee.' He answered: 'He is a Galilean?'<sup>154</sup> I shall send him to Herod and I shall know his life, of what descent he is, for, behold, his appearance is frightening like (that of) a royal son.' 118. Then he dismissed the Jews, called Jesus in private and said to him: 'Behold, the Jews have informed me that you are from Galilee. Well then, it has pleased me to send you to Herod, so that you will not say: "You judge me unfairly in a foreign country."' But Jesus did not answer anything.

119. Then Pilate got himself a papyrus<sup>155</sup> and wrote thereon as follows: 'Pontius Pilate writes to Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee. Since the chief priests and the people of the Jews have seized a young man because he destroys the

<sup>150</sup> The description is in the present tense, because the author based himself on contemporary literary and pictorial sources; see pp. 56–64.

<sup>151</sup> Coptic: ἀργούλλε; translation uncertain, see pp. 63–64.

<sup>152</sup> Or: 'on its edge, like a decorative strip (or: clavus)'; see p. 64.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. John 18:33–35.

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Luke 23:6.

<sup>155</sup> For χαρτίς, see pp. 66–67 above. The expression σμῖνε ἰσχυρῆς can mean 'compose a document,' in this case 'write a letter.' Crum, *Dictionary*, 338a, who quotes this passage and takes the word σμῖνε as here meaning 'compose, write,' nevertheless seems to have interpreted the word χαρτίς as 'papyrus,' as appears from his translation of the rest of the sentence: 'and wrote thereon as follows.' In § 122, a similar expression occurs: 'Herod ἀρχὴ ἰσχυρῆς and wrote thereon as follows,' which can only mean: 'Herod took a papyrus ...' It is most likely that the same idea is expressed in the passage above.

εφωλ εβολ ἡπνομος εφταψε οειω ρωσ νογτε αγω ρενκενηνηψε ἡψαχε  
 38a αγταροογ ερατογ. καν εγχε με καν εγχε σολ ἡτσοογн αν. εαιωγω ετῆνοογч  
 наκ хε ἡнекхоос | хе ексмῆ антпaθι нῆмай.

120. [α]φτωψε ἡτεπιστολη αq[τ]αас ἡογμα[τ]οι. χιη χῆ[q]το ἡπεροογ  
 [α]qμοοψε мῆ [ῑс] αqει ετга[λι]λaia αqен [τ]επιστολη [ῆ]πiлатос ἡρη[r]-  
 ωΔнс. 121. αγω ἡтереqоус аqраψε емате хе неqеπειθγmei εнаγ εῑс αγω  
 38b аqтpεγχитῑ наq ερογн. ἡтереqнаγ Δε ероq пexаq наq хе каκн κεφαλη ἡτοκ  
 петωторτῑ ἡтгaлilаia мῆ οἰλῆн. εic ογнoс ἡογοειω τсωтῑ εтвннтῑ. | ῑс Δε  
 ἡπεqоγωψ λaγ ептнрῑ.

122. тоте ρнρωΔнс αqχi ἡογχαρтнс аqсρaи ероq ἡτειρε хе pontios πiлатос  
 аixi ἡнесρaи ἡτεκмῆтсon аioφоу αγω тнῆтхaхе етῑм παρηт нῆмак аскотс  
 еγειрннн. 123. αγω пeиρωme ἡтактῆнооγч наi εic ογмннψе ἡромпе τсωтῑ  
 39a εтвннтῑ хе qωторτῑ ἡπiлаос αγω qωλ εβολ ἡἡпноμος. анок τeπθγmei εнаγ  
 ероq αγω ἡπнaте ἡпaи φaнтeтeкмῆтсon тῆнооγч наn танаγ ероq. 124. |  
 λοιπον εicρннте аitῆнооγч нак ρитῆ ἡργπεретнс ἡтактῆнооγч наi нῆмаγ  
 αγω ἡтеγнoγ етеqнаei нак ἡπεpанихе ἡмоq ἡογoγнoγ ἡoγωт einнтeи ἡгa-  
 λoq εхен oγψе ἡсрoс еpeпeчpo ктнγ εхῑм пpн εβολ хе ρωв нim етepeῆиoγΔaи  
 наxооγ ерок εтвннтῑ еγχε me αγω τo ἡмῆтpe нῆмаγ енеγκαтoикopia αγω  
 τωпe еpок.

125. εic пxωк ἡῆκαтнгорia ἡρнρωΔнс ρa пexс. аqτωψε ἡτεπιστολη  
 39b аqтаас ἡнeнтaγeи | мῆ ῑс. аγкo[тоγ] етеγρн ἡпnaγ ἡпpн eqнаρωтῑ [ῆп]ρoоγ  
 ἡoγ[ωт] етeпeт[ооγ ἡп]caввaтo[н] αγω аγῑ τ[εγ]ωн тнρс еγ[мо]oψе нῆ-  
 ма[q] ωa пnaγ ἡωωpῑ. ἡпnaγ Δε ἡ[пpн] eqнаωa a[γeи] ερογн етпoлic. 126.  
 аλλα ἡтаρнρωΔнс ῑ пaи ρωс еqт ρice ἡῑс. етве пaи ἡпeqанихе ἡмоq аλλα  
 аqхoоγч наq ρῆ oγβeпн хе moоγтῑ. аγт Δε ἡнесρaи ἡρнρωΔнс ἡπiлатос  
 ἡпnaγ ἡпpн eqнаωa ἡптoγ ἡпcaввaтoн.

law and preaches as (if he were) God, they have brought him before me and have put forward many other accusations. Whether they are speaking the truth or are lying, I do not know. It was my wish to send him to you, so that you would not say: "You are opposed to me."<sup>156</sup>

120. He sealed the letter and gave it to a soldier. From the fourth hour of the day he went with Jesus, arrived in Galilee and brought the letter of Pilate to Herod.<sup>157</sup> 121. And as he read it he was very pleased for he desired to see Jesus, and he had him brought before him. As he, then, saw him he said to him: 'Villain, you are the man who disturbs the peace of Galilee and Jerusalem! For a long time I have been hearing about you.' But Jesus did not answer anything at all.<sup>158</sup>

122. Then Herod took a papyrus and wrote thereon as follows: 'Pontius Pilate, I have received the letter of your brotherly kindness, I have read it and the enmity which was in my heart against you has turned into peace.'<sup>159</sup>

123. And this man whom you have sent to me, behold, for many years I have been hearing about him that he upsets the people and destroys the laws. I desired to see him<sup>160</sup> but I was unable to do so until your brotherly kindness sent him to us and I saw him. 124. Well then, behold, I have sent him back to you through the servants with whom you have sent him to me. And when he comes to you have no patience with him for one single hour except to put him upon a wooden cross, his face turned to the sun. For the Jews speak the truth with respect to everything they will tell you about him and my testimony corroborates their accusations, and I greet you.'

125. Behold, the whole of Herod's accusations against Christ! He sealed the letter and gave it to those who had come with Jesus. They returned on their way at sunset of that same day, namely the fourth day of the week, and they spent the whole night travelling with him until the early morning; at sunrise they entered the city. 126. But Herod did this in order to make Jesus suffer. Therefore, he did not keep him but sent him to Pilate without delay, saying: 'Kill him!'. They, then, gave the letter of Herod to Pilate at sunrise of the fifth day of the week.<sup>161</sup>

<sup>156</sup> Cf. Luke 23:12;  $\sigma\eta\eta\ \lambda\alpha\gamma\tau\iota\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota = \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ .

<sup>157</sup> According to Luke 23:7, Herod was in Jerusalem, as is also assumed by Pseudo-Cyril in §158. Here, in §120, the author is following his source.

<sup>158</sup> Luke 23:9.

<sup>159</sup> Cf. Luke 23:12.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. Luke 9:9.

<sup>161</sup> For the chronology, see p. 47.



127. And as Pilate had read it he said to the Jews: 'You have a law: on every feast I release someone from prison, whom the people will elect.<sup>162</sup> Come, let us persuade the crowd that I shall release Jesus. But I shall give you Barabbas on whose behalf the whole people testifies,<sup>163</sup> so that you can kill him.' 128. But as they understood that he wanted to release Jesus, they guilefully said to him: 'Behold, the sun has set and not all of the people are here; behold, the hour of retirement has come, give us Jesus that we may bring him to prison until tomorrow and secure him as it pleases us, and we shall go and deliberate with the crowd and we shall act in the morning as it pleases us.' 129. The chief priests, then, persuaded the crowd: 'When the governor says to you: "Whom do you want me to release to you?," say with one voice: "Barabbas!"'<sup>164</sup> And they came to an agreement with each other, and one after another went to his home.

130. Pilate, then, stood surety for Jesus until the morning, and he went into the dining-room and said to Jesus: 'Truly, I want to release you but I do not know what to do with this rebellious<sup>165</sup> people that wants to kill you.' 131. Pilate said: 'I have been told that you say you are a royal son.' Jesus said to him: 'My Kingdom is not of this world. If my Kingdom were of this world you would find that my soldiers and my officers would be fighting for me.<sup>166</sup> To be sure, you are a governor yourself and, behold, many people are soldiers in your service, but where are mine?' Pilate asked again: 'I have been told that you are the Son of God.' Jesus said to him: 'You have said so!'

132. Without further ado, Pilate prepared a table and he ate with Jesus on the fifth day of the week. And Jesus blessed Pilate and his whole house. 133. Then Pilate said to Jesus: 'Behold, I stood surety for you to the godless Jews. Well then, behold, the night has come, rise and withdraw, and when the morning comes and they accuse me because of you, I shall give them the only son I have so that they can kill him in your place.' 134. Jesus said to Pilate: 'Behold, the chief priests have persuaded the crowd to ask for Barabbas and, for my part, to kill me. When you rise up in the morning, show the letter of Herod and let them read it and put me on the cross as Herod has written, for all the prophets have prophesied about me that they will put me on the

<sup>162</sup> Cf. Matthew 27:15 ff.; Mark 15:6 ff.; Luke 23:17 ff.; John 18:39 f.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Luke 23:18; John 18:40. § 128 is uncanonical.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Matthew 27:20; Mark 15:11.

<sup>165</sup> That Pilate calls the Jews a rebellious people is a typical feature of the Pilate literature; see p. 38.

<sup>166</sup> John 18:36.

135. ω πῖλατος ἀκῆπῳα ἡοῖνος ἡρμὸτ χε ἀκοῖενῆ οὔπροζαῖρεσις ἐνανοῦς  
 42b ἐβολ ἐζοῖν ἐροῖ. ἀγῳ ἀγῳωμ ἡν νεγερνῇ ἡν | οὔρῆζαλ ἐφρῆ ἀμντε ἡρομπε  
 ἐφδιακονεῖ ναγ. ἡἡῆσῳς ἀγῆκοτῆ.

136. τότε πῖλατος πεχάφ ἡῖς χε ἀλνῳς †λγπει ἐτβνῆτῆ ἀγῳ ἐκῳαν-  
 σῳτῆ ἡσῳ κνατῳοῖν ἡκαναχωρεῖ νακ ἀγῳ ἐγῳαναναζτε ἡμοῖ ἐροκ †να†  
 ναγ ἡπαῳηρε ἡοῖωτ ἡσεῖρροῦ ἡμοῖ ζαροκ. 137. ῖς δε πεχάφ ἡπῖλατος χε  
 43a ἐνειοῖωῳ νεῖναεῖ ἀν πε ἐτειοῖνοῦ. τῳοῖν ἡγρῆμοος ἡγναγ χε οὔἡ ὅσῳ ἡμοῖ  
 ἐνοῖγῆ. πῖλατος δε ἀφῳωτ ἡσα ῖς | ἀγῳ εἰςζῆντε ἀφῆ ἀσῳματος ἡπεφναγ  
 ἐροῖ οὔνος ἡναγ. ἡἡῆσῳς ὅν ἀῖς εἰ ῳαροῖ. ἀῳωῆς ἡζῆτ ἡσῖ πῖλατος ἀῖς κα  
 τεφῳιχ ἐχῳα ἀτῳοῖν ἀφῆνφε. πεχε ῖς ναγ χε ἀκειμε χε εἰῳανοῖωῳ †να-  
 νοῖγῆ. πεχε πῖλατος χε ἀρε παχῳεῖς.

138. ἀγῳ ἀπῖλατος ζῖνῆβ ἡτεῖνοῦ ἀφναγ ἐγζορομα. ἐῳχε ἐρεοῖνος ἡκακε  
 ἡβολ ἐφπορῳ ἐβολ ἐχέμ προ ἡπκαζ τηρῆ. ἀγῳ νερεπκοσμος τηρῆ σοοῖγ  
 43b ἐζοῖν ἐνεγερνῇ ἐγῳ ἡβῆλε ἡσenaγ ἐβολ ἀν. ἀγῳ εἰς οὔαετος | ἀφει ἐβολ ζῆ  
 [τ]πε ἐρεοῖκολονβῳρα ἡ[οῖ]εἰν κῳτε ἐ[ροῖ] ἐρεοῖκλῳμ ζ[1]χεν τεφῳπε  
 ἀγῳ ἀποῖε[ἡν] ῳα ἡοῖκο[ῖ]. 139. ἀπαετος ῳῳ ἐβολ χε ποῖοεἰν ἡχαρραν  
 ἀγῳ ποῖοεἰν ἡχαναδαν ἀγῳαγ ἡτεχῳρα ἡκῆμε. ἡτεῖνοῦ ἀτῆρεῖς ἡἡεβρῳῖος  
 ὅω ἐγῳ ἡβῆλε ἡsenaγ ἐβολ ἀν. ἀγῳ νεῖωῳ ἐβολ χε ἐτῳν παετος ἡταφει  
 ἡπενοῖοεἰν ἡτῆμοοῖγῆ. 140. ἀγῳ ἀπαετος μοοῳε ἐζοῖν ἐπῖλαος ἡἡεβρῳῖος  
 44a ἀγῳαζτε ἡμοῖ ἀγῳ ἡμοῖ | [ε]χεν οὔῳἡν ἡατκαρπος [α]γῳοῖγῆ ἡμοῖ.  
 ἡῖἡἡκῆμε σῳοῖγ ἐπαετος [α]γῆ ῳἡρε χε [α]ῳμοῖ ἡτεῖνοῦ. ἀγῳ [α]παετος  
 ῳἡῆ ἀφρῳλ ἐβολ ἀφῳκ ἐρῳῖ ἐτπε ἐγῳωῳτ ἡσῳῖ ἡῳ ἡταφει ἡμος. ἀπῖλατος  
 νερσε ἐρῳῖ ζῆ προρομα ἐῳῳ ῳῳἡρε ἀφῳοῖ εῖς.

141. ἡἡῆσῳς ἀπροκλα ὅἡμε ἡπῖλατος ναγ ζῳς ἐγζορομα ἡτειοῖωἡ ἡοῖωτ  
 ἀγῳ ἀστῆνοοῖ ἡsa πῖλατος ἀsνερσε ἡμοῖ. ἡτερεπῖλατος δε βῳκ ῳαρος πεχῳς  
 44b ναγ χε | παχῳεῖς κα πεῖρῳμε ἐβολ ἀῳῖ ζαζ γαρ ἡῖσε ἡτειοῖωἡ ἐτβνῆτῆ.  
 142. νεῖναγ ἐροῖ τενοῖ ἐρεοῖαετος ἀρερατῆ ζῖχέμ παμα ἡενκοτῆ ἐφῳῳ ἡμος  
 ναῖ χε ὅ προκλα ἐρεποῖαρε ῳἡῳ ἡἡ πῳῖ ζῆ πεῖκοσμος παρῳ ποῖεν ἐῳῳἡτ  
 ἡοῖοῖνοῦ. 143. ἡτεῖνοῦ ἀγῳαζτε ἡμοῖ ἀγῳἡῆ ἡμοῖ ἐπεῖτῆς sῳαγ ἀγῳῳῖ

cross and crucify me. 135. Oh Pilate, you have been deemed worthy of a great grace because you have shown a good disposition to me.' And they ate with each other, while a slave of about ten years old served them. After that they went to sleep.<sup>167</sup>

136. Then Pilate said to Jesus: 'Truly, I am grieved because of you. And if you listen to me you shall rise and withdraw, and when they hold me accountable for you I shall give them my only son so that they can crucify him in your place.' 137. But Jesus said to Pilate: 'If I wished I would not come to this moment. Come, sit down and see that I am able to escape.' Pilate, then, looked at Jesus and, behold, he became incorporeal; he did not see him for a long time. After that Jesus came to him again. Pilate fainted but Jesus laid his hand upon him, and he rose and recovered his senses. Jesus said to him: 'Have you understood that if I wish I can escape?' Pilate said: 'Yes, my Lord.'

138. And Pilate fell asleep at once and had a vision.<sup>168</sup> There was, as it were, a great darkness outside, spread upon the face of the entire earth. And the whole world was gathered together, blind and not seeing. And, behold, an eagle came from heaven, with a cistern of light around it and a wreath on its head; and the light shone for a short time. 139. The eagle cried out: 'The light of Charran and the light of Canaan have been given to the land of Egypt.' The people of the Hebrews at that time remained blind and they did not see. And they cried out: 'Where is the eagle that has taken away our light so that we may kill him?' 140. And the eagle came to the people of the Hebrews. They seized him, brought him upon a fruitless tree and killed him. The Egyptians gathered to the eagle, they were amazed that he immediately died. And the eagle lived (again), he flew away and while they were looking at him<sup>169</sup> he went up to heaven as he had come. Pilate awoke in amazement from his dream and told it to Jesus.

141. After that, Procla, Pilate's wife, also had a vision that same night, and she sent for Pilate and wakened him. As Pilate came to her she said to him: 'My lord, release this man, for because of him I have suffered much this night.'<sup>170</sup> 142. I saw myself a moment ago while an eagle was standing near my couch, saying to me: "Oh Procla, your lifetime in this world is equal to mine except for the third part of an hour." 143. At once he was seized, his two

---

<sup>167</sup> The story of Pilate continues with § 138, which suggests that §§ 136 (repeating what had already been said in § 133) and 137 probably derive from another source; see p. 35.

<sup>168</sup> For the dreams of Pilate and Procla, see p. 35.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Acts 1:9.

<sup>170</sup> Matthew 27:17.



45a εβολ ἡτεφαπε αἰμοῦ. ἀγὼ πεχαὶ ἄε εἰς παῆτος αἰμοῦ ἀνοκ ῥω †ηαμοῦ κατὰ  
 ὅε ἡταῖμοῦ. τενοῦ ὅε ἡπῖρ̄ πεῶοῦ εἰπειω|με ἄἡνεκμοῦ. εἰς ἡῖταιναῦ ἐροοῦ  
 αἰχοοῦ ἐτεκῆῖντсон.

144. τότε πλάτος αἰρ̄ ὦπηρε ἡπεϋχε πρорона ἐτεϋςῑме φαντεϋει ἡϋχοοϋ  
 εῖς. ἀγὼ ἀπλάτος φάχε μῆ ῑς αἰτсавоϋ ἐπρорона ἡταῖναῦ ἐροῦ μῆ πεντα-  
 τεϋςῑме наῦ ἐροῦ. 145. πεχε ῑς наῦ ἄε ῥῑме пентакχοοῦ тηροῦ сенаϋωπε  
 ἡме. ω πλάτος ἡπῖρ̄κωλῦ ἡῖοῦΔαι ἐμοῦοῦт ἡμοι. πειρорона ἡтакнаῦ ἐροῦ  
 οῖноб пе πεϋнонма. 146. παῆτος ἡтакнаῦ ἐροῦ ἀνοκ пе. πεикаке ἡтаϋπωρϋ  
 45b εβολ | ριχῆ πκαρ пе тῑῖтρεϋωῖϋе εἰλωλον μῆ н[о]ве ним етер[еῖ]ρωме εἰρε  
 ἡμοοῦ. ἀγὼ тколовнѠра ἡтакнаῦ ἐρος ἐскѠте ἐροι πμοοῦ пе ἡпваптисма  
 ἡтаиваптize ἡзнтῑ ἀγὼ †ηатреοῦон ним ἡтаῦпisteϋе ἐροι φορεῖ ἡμοῦ. 147.  
 ἀγὼ πεиклом ἐтρiхен таапе μῆ пѠнн ἡтаῦтalloι ἐχωϋ φά पेῖнаῦ ἡрасте  
 сенаϋωнт̄ ἡοῦκлом ἡсеталоϋ ἐхен таапе ἀγὼ сенаκωρε ἡοῦϋнн ἡсета-  
 46a λοι ἐχωϋ. 148. ἀγὼ ποῦοειν | ἡтаϋφά ἐχωῖ χῖн χῖ(ϋомте)<sup>a</sup> ἡрасте прн наφά  
 [ε]χῆ πλαος тн[r]ῑ ἡѠе етеϋφά ἡннне φά пнаῦ ἡхῖ(со).<sup>b</sup> οῡκαке наϋωπε  
 ριχῆ πκαρ тнрῑ φά пнаῦ ἡхῖῖте. φарепрн ῖкаке ἡтепооr ῖ еви етῖῖр οῡοειн  
 ерраῖ ἐхῆ πκαρ. 149. ἀγὼ περрооῦ ἡтапаῆτος ωϋ εβολ ἡμοῦ ἀνοκ ῥω †ηαωϋ  
 εβολ ἄε паеῖωт †† ἡпаῖῖа енеκσιχ. ἀγὼ сенало е(γ)смῖ<sup>c</sup> διαϋῡκн μῆ ἡεεвра-  
 46b ιος ἡсеснime μῆ ἡῖῖῖкнме. ἡнеεεпрофнтнс ϋωπε | ρῖ пгенос ἡῖεεвраиос φά  
 енез. 150. ἀλλα πλαος етеписоῡωнῑ ἡтоῦ αἰρ̄ ρῖгaл наῖ ἀγὼ ἡῖῖῖкнме ἡтак-  
 наῦ ἐροοῦ еῡсооῡг ἐροι е(ι)χῖ<sup>d</sup> ἡпime ἡпаῆτος сенаκωт ἡῖῖекκλнcia ἡсеϋῖϋе  
 наῖ ἡзнтоῡ ἡсеῖω еῡеῖре ἡпmeϋе ἡтаапастаcic ἀγὼ еῡῖ ϋπηρε ἡпамоῦ. 151.  
 ω πλάτος ἡѠе ἡтапаῆτος ноῦ ριχῆ οῡϋнн таῖ те ὅе е†ηαμοῦ ριχῆ οῡсῖрос  
 47a ἀγὼ он ἡѠе ἡтапаῆτος ωнῑ εῖϋаηноῦ †ηαωнῑ †ηαтωοῡн ρῖ нетмооῡт |

<sup>a</sup> M co; see note to translation.<sup>b</sup> M ῡтте; see note to translation.<sup>c</sup> M εἰсмῖ.<sup>d</sup> M еῡχῖ.

wings were bound, his head was cut off, and he died. And I said: "Behold, the eagle has died. I too shall die like he died." Therefore, do no harm to this man lest you should die. Behold, I have told your brotherly love the things I have seen.'

144. Then Pilate was amazed, (but) he did not tell (his own) vision to his wife before he had gone and told it to Jesus. And Pilate spoke with Jesus, he informed him of the vision he had seen and of that which his wife had seen. 145. Jesus said to him: 'All the things you have said are true, they will really happen. Oh Pilate, do not prevent the Jews from killing me. This vision you have seen has a great significance. 146. The eagle you saw is me. This darkness that was spread out upon the earth is the idol worship and all sins men commit. And the cistern you saw around me is the water of baptism with which I have baptized,<sup>171</sup> and I shall make every one who believes in me to bear it. 147. And as to this wreath upon my head and the tree upon which they put me, by this hour of tomorrow they will plait a wreath and put it upon my head and they will cut down a tree and put me upon it. 148. And as to the light that shone on me, from the third hour of tomorrow the sun will shine on the whole people as it shines every day, until the sixth hour.<sup>172</sup> Darkness will come upon the whole earth until the ninth hour, the sun will be darkened and the moon will become dark so that they do not shine upon the earth. 149. And as to the cry uttered by the eagle, I too shall cry out: "My Father, I give my spirit into your hands."<sup>173</sup> And there will be no longer a covenant made with the Hebrews but it will be made with the Egyptians. There will not arise another prophet from the race of the Hebrews for ever. 150. But the people I did not know have served me, and the Egyptians you saw gathering to me as I took the likeness of the eagle will build churches to worship me therein and to continue to commemorate my resurrection and to marvel at my death. 151. Oh Pilate, as the eagle died upon a tree, so I shall die upon a cross, and also as the eagle lived, so I shall live when I die. I shall

<sup>171</sup> The Greek word for 'cistern' (κολυμβήθρα), used in § 138 and here (resp. κολομβήθρα and κολοβήθρα), was a common term for the baptismal font; see Lampe, *Lexicon*, 766a, s.v. B.

<sup>172</sup> The Coptic Ms. reads here 'from the sixth hour ... until the ninth hour.' The scribe apparently thought of the three hours of darkness mentioned in the synoptic Gospels (Matthew 27:45; Mark 15:33; Luke 23:44) and must have forgotten that he had written 'the sun will shine.' The readings 'sixth' and 'ninth' can only be maintained if we read 'the sun will not shine' (ἡμερην ὥς instead of πρὶν λαοῦ). But the parallelism with the light shining on the eagle (= Christ) requires the readings 'third' and 'sixth.' The darkness until the ninth hour is mentioned by Pseudo-Cyril in the next sentence.

<sup>173</sup> Luke 23:46. At this point, the weak parallelism between the eagle and Christ becomes extremely thin; in the dream the eagle only cried at its arrival (§ 139).

ἡπαμεζωονῆτ ἡροογ ταςωτε ἡαλαμ ἡῖ νεφωhre ἡτακτοq ετεqархн ἡкесоп.  
 eis pbwλ ἡῖῖτακῖау ерооу ἡῖ нептатексime нау ерооу асхооу ерок.

152. πατος ἡтапроκλα нау ероq зixῖ песма ἡенкотῖ ω πιατος ἡток пе.  
 аѡ хинтаѡхпос ерепесазе ѡнѡ ἡῖ пок аѡ зῖ пезооу еткнамоу сῖамоу  
 47b зѡѡс ἡзнтῖ. тексime нанау ерок зῖ пеооу етнаѡпе ἡмок ἡсхоос хе  
 замои | еῖῖῖтаinoу ἡῖмак ѡ пасон пιαтос аѡ ἡпаτεпѡахе сѡл[ῖ] зῖ рѡс  
 сῖ[азе] ἡсноу ἡте[γ]ноу ἡтет[на]ѡпе зῖ о[γ]тафос ἡоуѡ[т] ѡа енез.  
 153. аѡ етве пнау ἡтаγсѡнῖ ἡпаетос сенасѡнῖ ἡмок зѡѡк ἡсехитῖ ератῖ  
 ἡῖрро неѡтреѡѡт ἡпекмакῖ евол зῖ оγснqe ἡῖр мартγрос.

154. ѡа пeиma пе пѡахе eis πογоеin аѡѡа. наi ѡе ἡтаѡѡпе ἡпенхоеis  
 48a ῖс пexс ѡа пeиma прос нетснз зῖ ἡѡγсмос | ἡῖапостолос. 155. аѡ тῖсооγн  
 хе оγῖ оγон ерон [αλ]λα ерѡан[п]ноγте каан зῖ псѡма тῖнамез пехреѡс  
 етерон [а]ѡ тῖнаатамѡтῖ ѡе ἡтаγсрѡу ἡῖхс ἡῖ ѡе ἡтаiѡснq ἡῖ нiko-  
 аhмос кѡѡс ἡпeѡсma аγкааq зῖ оγтафос ἡῖ ѡе ἡтаѡтѡоγн евол зῖ  
 нетmoоγт зῖ пнезѡонῖт ἡзооу ἡῖ ѡе ἡтаѡоγѡнῖ етῖтасхпoq наpia тпар-  
 48b ѡенос етоγаав ката тῖῖтῖῖтре ἡпѡhre ἡпeзpoγβαι | iѡзaнннс пeγaггeлi-  
 стнс. 156. аѡ тῖсооγн хе анернт ннтῖ exе зῖкоγi ерѡтῖ етве псаbбатон

rise from the dead on the third day to redeem Adam and his children and to make him return to his origin again.<sup>174</sup> That is the solution to what you saw and to what your wife saw and told you.<sup>175</sup>

152. The eagle which Procla saw near her couch, oh Pilate, is you. And from her birth her life-time is equal to yours, and on the day that you will die she, too, will die. Your wife will see you in the glory that will befall you and she will say: "Oh, that I had died with you, oh my brother Pilate!" And before the word will leave her mouth she will fall down<sup>176</sup> and die immediately, and you will be in one tomb forever.<sup>177</sup> 153. And concerning the vision that the eagle was bound, you will be bound too and you will be brought to the Emperor and he will have your neck cut off with a sword and you will become a martyr.<sup>178</sup>

154. So far for our exposition; behold the light has risen. These things, now, have happened to our Lord, Jesus Christ, up to this point according to what has been written in the *Constitutions of the Apostles*.<sup>179</sup> 155.<sup>180</sup> And we know that we owe you more, but if God leaves us in the body we shall fulfil what we are due and we shall inform you about how Christ was crucified and how Joseph and Nicodemus prepared his body for burial and put it into a tomb<sup>181</sup> and how he rose from the dead on the third day and how he appeared to her who has brought him forth, Mary, the holy Virgin, according to the testimony of the Son of Thunder,<sup>182</sup> John the Evangelist. 156. We also know that we promised you to tell you a few things about the (Holy) Week, and

<sup>174</sup> For this expression, see § 52 with note.

<sup>175</sup> The last words are a little awkward, because the solution of Procla's dream is still to come.

<sup>176</sup> Because of a lacuna in the Ms., the reading is uncertain.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. *Paradosis of Pilate*, 10 (Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 455; Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 526): 'The prefect cut off Pilate's head and, behold, an angel of the Lord received it. As Procla, his wife, saw that the angel came and received his head, she was immediately filled with joy and also gave up her spirit and was buried with her husband.'

<sup>178</sup> For Pilate as a martyr, see *Paradosis of Pilate*, 10 (Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 455; Santos Otero, *Evangelios apocrifos*, 526,): 'All generations and families of the gentiles will bless you, because in your days were fulfilled all those things which had been said about me by the prophets and you will be seen yourself as my witness (or martyr, μάρτυς) at my second coming when I shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel and those who have not confessed my name' (for the continuation of this text, see the preceding note).

<sup>179</sup> See p. 13 and § 108.

<sup>180</sup> On this section, see pp. 113–114.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. John 19:38–42.

<sup>182</sup> Cf. John 20:11–18 and § 58 with note 74. The 'Son of Thunder' comes from Mark 3:17.



after we spoke about how they deceitfully seized Jesus, (we told you) how they brought him to Pontius Pilate. But the exposition has continued much longer than we intended, because of the sweetness of the sufferings of our Saviour, Jesus Christ.

157. But we shall return to the teachings of the twelfth day of the moon of the month April, which is Parmoute.<sup>183</sup> The Jews seized Jesus on the fourth day of the week. Oh, this day of sorrow and grief of heart, which is the present day! 158. Today they set up the first tribunal; today they struck Christ in the house of Caiaphas; today Peter denied Christ three times in the house of Caiaphas; today the servant struck Jesus in his divine face because of our salvation. 159. On this very day Christ walked on foot and went to Herod in Jerusalem; today Herod cried out to Jesus: 'Villain!'<sup>184</sup> Today the joy of the Jews turned into mourning (for us); today the Jews cried out: 'Great is our joy today, for we have seized our enemy!' It is fitting for us to eat ashes in stead of our bread, according to the word of king David.<sup>185</sup>

160. I think I have said enough to your charity<sup>186</sup> today in this catechesis, I, this most humble Cyril, for I have dared to tell you a few things of the sufferings which our Saviour endured for the salvation of all of us. 161. As to us, Christians, then, may God who has suffered for us keep us pure from every pollution. Well then, oh my sons and my daughters who listen to the words of this catechesis today, which is the fourth day of the Pascha of our salvation: Glory to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, the consubstantial Trinity, who gives life to the universe, now and always for ever and ever. Amen.<sup>187</sup>

Lord, Jesus Christ, bless and guard the life of the archpriest Father Paul. Pray for him, my holy fathers, for he has provided for this book by his own labours. He has donated it to the (Monastery of the) Holy Archangel Michael, at

<sup>183</sup> For the chronology, see pp. 45–46. The spelling ἀπριλιος for April is Faiyumic. According to Cervenka-Diethart, *Lexikon*, Fasz. I, 93–94, s.v. Ἀπριλιος etc., this form does not occur in the Greek papyri; the word is not mentioned in Foerster's *Wörterbuch*.

<sup>184</sup> The denial of Peter (Matthew 26:69–75; Mark 14:66–72; Luke 22:54–62; John 18:15–17, 25–27) and the servant's behaviour (John 18:22) are mentioned here for the first time. In § 120, following his source, Pseudo-Cyril had Jesus go to Herod in Galilee.

<sup>185</sup> Ps. 102:9 (LXX 101:10): 'For I eat ashes like bread, and mingle tears with my drink.'

<sup>186</sup> For the Greek ἀγάπη as a form of address ('your charity'), see Lampe, *Lexicon*, 8 s.v., G. The same expression in Pseudo-Evodius of Rome, *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 81 (ed. Chapman in Depuydt, *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, CSCO 544, 123 [text], 545 [translation], 108), and in Pseudo-Cyril, *On the Virgin Mary*, 5 (ed. Campagnano, *Omélies coptes*, 156).

<sup>187</sup> For the colophon, see pp. 3–4.

παν̄ δε̄κας̄ ε̄ρεπαρχαγγε̄λος̄ μιχαηλ̄ παρακᾱλῑ ᾱ̄περρο̄ πε̄χς̄ ε̄ρραῑ ε̄χω̄ ᾱ̄φκω̄  
 νᾱ ἑβολ̄ ᾱ̄νεφνοβε̄ ᾱγω̄ οη̄ ᾱ̄φσω̄τεμ̄ ᾱ̄τεισμη̄ ε̄βολ̄ ρῑτοοτ̄ ᾱ̄π̄ς̄ ῑς̄ δε̄ ᾱμο̄  
 ω̄ραῑ π̄ρεμ̄ζαλ̄ ε̄τ̄νανο̄ ἑ̄ ᾱγω̄ ᾱ̄πισ̄τος̄ βο̄κ̄ ε̄ρο̄γ̄ν̄ ε̄πρᾱω̄ε̄ ᾱ̄πεκ̄ς̄. ρ̄ᾱμ̄ν̄.

the monastic settlement in the desert near Soupouhes in the nome of the Faiyum, in order that the Archangel Michael may beseech the King, Christ, on his behalf to forgive him his sins, and he, too, may hear this word from the Lord Jesus: 'Come to me, good and faithful servant, go in to the joy of your Lord!' Amen.





## APPENDICES

### 1. *Texts on the Parents and the Worldly Professions of the Apostles*<sup>1</sup>

1.1. Textus anonymus, *De apostolorum parentibus*, ed. Th. Schermann, *Prophetarum Vitae fabulosae. Indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicata*, Lipsiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1907, 202–204.

#### Text

#### ΤΑ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΙΒ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΓΕΝΝΗΣΑΝΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ

- α'. β'. Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ἀδελφοί, ἐκ πατρός Ἰωάννου καὶ μητρός Ἰωάννης, ἀλιεῖς τὴν τέχνην, ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδᾶς τῆς κώμης.
- γ'. δ'. Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀδελφοί, ἐκ πατρός Ζεβεδαίου, μητρός καὶ Ἱεροκλείας, ἀλιεῖς καὶ αὐτοί.
- ε'. Φίλιππος ἐκ πατρός Φιλισάνω, μητρός δὲ Σοφίας, ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδᾶς τῆς κώμης, ἡνίοχος τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα.
- ς'. Θωμᾶς ὁ καὶ Δίδυμος ὦν μετὰ ἀδελφῆς λεγομένης Λυσίας, ἐκ πατρός Διαφανοῦς, μητρός δὲ Ῥώας, ἀπὸ Αντιοχείας.
- ζ'. Βαρθολομαῖος ἐκ πατρός Σωσθένους, μητρός δὲ Οὐρανίας, πωμαρίτης ἦτοι λαχάνια φυτεύων.
- η'. Θαδδαῖος ὁ καὶ Λεββαῖος ἐκ πατρός Νεκροφάνους, μητρός δὲ Σελήνης, Ἰταλικός.
- θ'. Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου ἐκ πατρός Ἀνδρόνους, μητρός δὲ Εὐτυχίας, ἀπὸ Ἱεραπόλεως, λαοξόος τὴν τέχνην.
- ι'. Ματθαῖος ὁ καὶ Λεβί, τελώνης τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα, ἐκ πατρός Ῥούκου, μητρός δὲ Χαιροθείας, ἀπὸ Γαλιλαίας.
- ια'. Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης, ἀριστοκλήτωρ<sup>2</sup> τοῦ κυρίου εἰς τοὺς γάμους, ἐκ πατρός Καλλίου, μητρός δὲ Καμίας.
- ιβ'. Σίμων ὁ καλούμενος ζηλωτής, ἀπὸ Σαλεῖμ, ἐκ πατρός Ζήνωνος, μητρός δὲ ... Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης.

#### Translation

#### THE NAMES OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES AND OF THEIR PARENTS

1. 2. Peter and Andrew were brothers; their father was John and their mother Joanna; they were fishermen by profession and were from the village of Bethsaida.

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 14–33.

<sup>2</sup> Schermann reads ἀριστόκλητος ὦν (with the majority of the Mss.), but see p. 30.

3. 4. James and John were brothers; their father was Zebedee and their mother Hierokleia; they were fishermen too.
5. Philip's father was Philisaneos, his mother Sophia; he was from the village of Bethsaida and was a charioteer by occupation.
6. Thomas who is also called Didymus, because he was a twin with a sister called Lysia; his father was Diaphanes, his mother Rhoa; he was from Antioch.
7. Bartholomew's father was Sosthenes, his mother Ourania; he was a fruiterer or a grower of greens.
8. Thaddaeus who is also called Lebbaeus: his father was Necrophanes, his mother Selene; he was an Italian.
9. James the son of Alphaeus: his father was Andron, his mother Eutychia; he was from Hierapolis and was a sculptor (or: stonemason) by profession.
10. Matthew who is also called Levi: he was a tax collector by occupation; his father was Rhoukos, his mother Chaerotheia; he was from Galilee.
11. Simon the Cananite: he was the noble inviter of the Lord to the marriage; his father was Kallion, his mother Kamia.
12. Simon who is called the Zealot: he was from Salim; his father was Zeno, his mother [...].  
Judas Iscariot.

1.2. Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *A Homily on the Resurrection and the Apostles*, 83–84; ed. Z. Pleše, in L. Depuydt (gen. ed.), *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library. Seven Coptic Homilies Attributed to Basil the Great, John Chrysostom and Euodius of Rome* (CSCO 524 [edition]), Louvain: CSCO, 1991, 74:

### Text<sup>3</sup>

ΕΥΓΕΝΗ ΠΚΟСМОС ΓΑΡ ΕΝΕΡΓΑΤΗΣ ΝΕ ΔΥΩ ΟΥΝΤΑΙ ΤΕΥΕΙΟΠΕ ΗΝΔΥ ΩΑΝΤΟΥΕΩ ΘΗΒΟΗ  
ΕΩΝΕ ΜΗ ΝΕΥΩΗΡΕ.

1. 2. ΠΕΤΡΟС ΜΗ ΑΝΔΡΕΑС ΠΕΥСОН ΕΝΟΥΩΡΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΕ. ΙΩΩΑΝΝΗС ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΡΑΗ ΗΠΕΥΕΙΩΤ  
ΒΑΡΙΩΝΑ ΠΕ ΠΡΑΗ ΗΤΕΥΗΑΔΥ ΔΥΩ ΕΝΕΥΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΠΕΤРОС ΗΩΟΡΠ ΔΕ СΙМОН. ΕΝΕΥ-  
ΩΟΟΠ ΕΗ ΠΧΟΙ ΗΤΟΟΥ ΜΗ ΝΕΥΕΙΩΠΕ ΕΤΗΠΟΥΤΑΖМОУ. ΕΦΗΜΑΥ ΗΒΙ ΕΡΟΥΦΟС ΜΗ  
ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔРОС ΗΠΟΥΤΑΖМОУ.
3. 4. ΙΩΩΑΝΝΗС ΕΩΩΩ ΜΗ ΙΑΚΩВОС ΠΕΥСОН ΕΝΟΥΩΡΕ ΕΩΟΥ ОН ΝΕ. ΖΕВЕΔΑΙОС ΠΕ  
ΠΕΥΕΙΩТ ЗІЕРОКН ТЕ ТΕΥΗΑΔΥ. ΕΥΩΟΟΠ ΕΗ ΠΕΥΧΟΙ ΜΗ ΠΕΥΕΙΩТ ΜΗ ΝΕΥΕΙΩΠΕ  
ΕΥО ΗΟΥΗΝΤΟΥΩРЕ ΗΟΥΩТ. ΔΥΩ ΑΠΕХС СΟТΠΟΥ ΔΥΑΔΥ ΝΑΩ ΗΝΔΘΗТΗΣ ΑΥΛΟ ΕΥΒΕΠ  
ТВТ ΕΥΟΥΩΗ ΔΥΡ ΡΕУВЕР ΡΩМЕ ΕТНΗТЕРО ΗННПННУЕ.

<sup>3</sup> My thanks are due to Mr. Paul Peeters, Peeters Publishers, Louvain, for his permission to print the text of Pleše's edition. However, this edition is not a critical edition of the text but a reproduction of (the structure of) the manuscript, though without any indication of its interpunctuation and superlinear strokes. I have divided the text into separate sentences, added the usual superlinear strokes, numbered the apostles in order to facilitate comparison with the Greek text, and provided a translation of my own.

5. 84. ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΟΥΡῬΗΒΗΔΣΑΙΔΑ ΠΕ. ΠΕΤΡΗΡΕ ΠΕ ΝΟΥΕΝΙΟΧΟΣ ἸΤΕΠΑΓΩΝ.
6. ΘΩΜΑΣ ΟΥΑΝΔΙΟΧΕΥΣ ΠΕ ΝΚΥΚΛΕΥΤΗΣ.
7. ΒΑΡΘΟΛΟΜΑΙΟΣ ΟΥΚΟΜΑΡΙΤΗΣ ΠΕ ΝΣΑΟΥΟΤΕ.
8. ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΣ ΟΥΤΕΛΩΝΗΣ ΠΕ ΕΥΧΙ ΤΕΛΟΣ.
9. ΣΙΜΩΝ ΟΥΡΕΦΤΩΣῆ ΠΕ ΕΠΜΑΝΩΕΛΕΕΤ.
10. ΙΟΥΔΑΣ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΙΑΚΩΒΟΣ ΟΥΧΠΟ ΝΡΑΤΡΗ ΠΕ Νῆ ΟΥΣΩΝΕ ΧΕ ΛΗΤΙΑ ΤΑΙ ΝΤΑΣΡ  
ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΕΣΔΙΑΚΟΝΕΙ ΕΝΕΤΩΩΝΕ.
11. ΙΑΚΩΒΟΣ ΠΕΤΟΥΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΧΕ ΠΣΟΝ ἸΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΙΩΣΗΦ ΕΥΖΑΜΩΕ ΠΕ.

### Translation

(See also Pleše's translation in CSCO 525, Louvain 1991, 78–79)

While they (the apostles) were in the world, they were workmen and had their craft, so that they and their children might live.

1. 2 For Peter and his brother Andrew were fishermen. The name of their father, then, was John, Bar-Jōna<sup>4</sup> was the name of their mother, and Peter was first called Simon. They were in the boat with their servants, who were not called. Although Rufus and Alexander were there, they were not called.
3. 4 John and his brother James were also fishermen. Zebedee was their father and Hierokē their mother. They were in their boat with their father and their servants, since they were of the same fisher craft. And Christ chose them and made them his disciples. They stopped catching fish for food and became fishers of men for the kingdom of the heavens.
5. 84. Philip was from Bethsaida. He was the son of a charioteer in the races.
6. Thomas was from Antioch, a tender of the waterwheel.
7. Bartholomew was a gardener, a grower and seller of greens.<sup>5</sup>
8. Matthew was a publican who collected taxes.
9. Simon was an inviter to the wedding.
10. Judas son of James was a twin together with a sister called Lētia, who died<sup>6</sup> when taking care of the sick.
11. James, who is called 'the Lord's Brother,' was the son of Joseph and a carpenter.

1.3. A list of the Apostles on three Coptic ostraca, edited by W.E. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and Others*, London: The Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902, No. 436, p. 72 (section Texts) and 74 (section Translations and Commentaries); A. Biedenkopf-Ziehner, *Koptische Ostraka, I: Ostraka aus dem Britischen Museum*

<sup>4</sup> For an explanation of this strange name (lit. 'Son of John'), see p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Pleše: 'a Komaritan herb-seller'; for the term κομαριτης, see pp. 22–25 above.

<sup>6</sup> Lit.: 'who became blessed.'

in London. *Mit Einführung in das Formular der vorgelegten Urkunden*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000, 303–306, No. BM 42 (inv. No. 50 235), and Plate 43; A. Delattre, ‘Un nouveau témoin des listes d’apôtres apocryphes en copte,’ *Orientalia* 79 (2010), 74–79.

### Text<sup>7</sup>

- 1–4. ἡ ἀποστολὸς<sup>8</sup> πेत्रὸς ἡν ἀνδρεᾶς ἡν ἰακώβος ἡν ἰωάννης ἑνοῦωζε νε.
5. φιλιππος παῖρ πε ἡνοῦνοχος<sup>9</sup> ἐφχῶρῃ ἑν παγων. οὐρῆβηθσαιδα πε.<sup>10</sup>
6. θωμάς οὐαντιοχεῦς<sup>11</sup> πε ἡκῆλεῦτης.<sup>12</sup>
7. βαρθολωμάιος οὐκομαρίτης πε ἡσα ἡοῦοτε.
8. θαδδαῖος οὐλατῶμος πε ἡρεχεῖς ὠνε.

### Translation:

- 1–4. The apostles Peter, Andrew, James, and John were fishermen.
5. Philip was the son of a charioteer who drove in the races.<sup>13</sup> He was from Bethsaida.
6. Thomas was from Antioch, a tender of the waterwheel.
7. Bartholomew was a gardener, a grower / seller of greens.
8. Thaddaeus was a stonemason, a stonecutter.

## 2. A Letter of Epiphanius of Salamis on the Chronology of Holy Week

Epiphanius, *Letter on the Chronology of Holy Week*; ed. K. Holl, ‘Ein Bruchstück aus einem bisher unbekannten Brief des Epiphanius,’ in idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Band II: *Der Osten*, Tübingen, 1928 (reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), 204–224.

<sup>7</sup> B = tekst edited by Biedenkopf-Ziehner; C = text edited by Crum; D = text edited by Delattre. The many orthographic errors, especially in D, have not been recorded, with two exceptions (see notes 8 and 11).

<sup>8</sup> C and D om.; hardly visible in B.

<sup>9</sup> B. add. πε; C ἡνοῦνοχος.

<sup>10</sup> As to content, D ends here; the next words (ἐφχῶρῃ ἑν π ...) are a dittographic error.

<sup>11</sup> C ends with οὐα-.

<sup>12</sup> Β κελεῦτης, which Biedenkopf-Ziehner derived from καλέω and interpreted as ‘Ausrufer?’, which was adopted by Förster, *Wörterbuch*, 401, with the remark: ‘möglicherweise für κελευστής?’

<sup>13</sup> Biedenkopf-Ziehner, 304, takes ἐφχῶρῃ ἑν παγων as an independent clause (‘er fährt Wettrennen’): ‘Mit diesem Zusatz ... wird nun auch hier [i.e., as in the Greek list] gesagt, daß Philippos denselben Beruf hatte wie sein Vater.’ She seems to follow here Crum’s interpretation, who, moreover, as appears from his translation, saw a plural form in the obviously corrupt word ἡνοῦνοχος: ‘Philip was the son of charioteers and drove in the race.’

First publication in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag, 26. Januar, 1927*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1927, 159–189. A German translation is found in Lohse, *Ursprung und Geschichte*, 316–317.

### Translation

*An accurate explanation of the day of the Passion by our Father among the Saints Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in the island of Cyprus. From the letter to Eusebius, Marcellus, Vivianus, and Carp, but also to the Egyptians.*<sup>14</sup>

The Jews, then, with whom the Lord ate the Passover, ate it two days before the fixed true Passover, because the scribes and the pharisees said: 'Let us anticipate the celebration of the Passover, lest we cannot eat the Passover in the turmoil caused by his arrest.' This is confirmed by the most holy Matthew when he says of the Saviour that he spoke to his disciples: 'You know that after two days the Passover will take place and that the Son of Man will be handed over to be crucified.'<sup>15</sup> And this was exactly fulfilled when Christ led (them) to the mystery on the second day of the week, since the tenth day is a symbol of the name of our Lord Jesus because of the *iōta*.<sup>16</sup> For on that day Judas received 'the price of the man that was valued, whom they valued among the children of Israel,' according to what has been written,<sup>17</sup> and he sought an opportunity to deliver him. They were in confusion and, therefore, they anticipated (the Passover) instead of keeping the lamb that they had bought for themselves until the fifth day, because they had given the silver pieces to Judas and because they reckoned from the tenth to the fourteenth day, which was the fifth of the week. They anticipated (the Passover) since they were in confusion because of the people and said: 'Let us anticipate the celebration of the Passover, in order to prevent that we cannot arrest him when the people comes.' And for that reason, they did not eat the Passover on the usual fifth day, which fell on the fourteenth day of

<sup>14</sup> In Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 204, the words 'but also to the Egyptians' seem to have dropped out of the text, but they are cited at p. 224: *πρὸς Εὐσέβιον καὶ Μάρκελλον, Βιβιανόν τε καὶ Κάρπον· ἔτι μὲν καὶ πρὸς Αἰγυπτίους*. Holl's lapse was also noted by Lohse, *Ursprung und Geschichte*, 319, n. 5.

<sup>15</sup> Matthew 26:2. The suggestion is that Jesus said that after two days it would be the real date of Passover.

<sup>16</sup> As will be explained later in the text, the pact between Judas and the Jewish leaders was made on the 10th of Nisan, the second day of the week, which was considered the beginning of the passion of Christ. The first letter (*iōta*) of the name of Jesus has the numerical value of 10.

<sup>17</sup> Matthew 27:9 (cf. Zechariah 11:12 f.).

the moon, but they arrested Christ on the third day of the week when the fourth drew on, and on that day they also performed the Passover that they had anticipated.

He (Jesus), then, ate the Passover together with them by the evening on the twelfth day, two days before the (real) Passover, as the thirteenth drew on, the night being reckoned to the day, i.e. from the third to the fourth day of the week. For that reason the church keeps the fourth day, because of the arrest of the Lord, fasting through the entire year with the only exception of Witsuntide and Epiphany. Being arrested by the evening as the fourth day drew on, he remained in the courtyard of Caiaphas during the whole night.<sup>18</sup> For do not think that he was arrested by the evening of the fifth day of the week: read the Gospel according to John, examine it and you see that after his arrest he was brought from Gethsemane to Caiaphas. He remained in the house of Caiaphas until dawn. In the early morning he was handed over to Pontius Pilate. This happened on the fourth day of the week. And he passed the whole day with Pontius Pilate, and also the whole night until dawn. On the fifth day of the week he was sent to Herod, who was then in Jerusalem, because he, too, had come to eat the Passover with the other (Jews). And as he asked him many things and was not worthy to receive an answer, he sent him back to Pilate, and he (Jesus) remained locked up in the praetorium until the ninth hour. A certain tradition has descended to our time of people who say that at the ninth hour the disciples came to him in secret and that he broke mere bread and ate it with them in prison. He remained there the whole night and very early in the morning he (Pilate) brought him out of the praetorium on the day before the Sabbath, which is called the Preparation, and so he was crucified at the third hour, according to the accurate explanation of Mark and John, the divinely inspired evangelists. And (this holds true) even if because of a scribal error in some copies of the Gospel according to John the letter gamma (Γ), which indicates the number three, has been distorted into that of the digamma (Ϝ), which represents the number six, due to the fact that we see the strokes of both letters project from the left to the right, which before us also Clement, Origen and Pamphilus Eusebius rightly understood.<sup>19</sup> Listeners that are eager to learn

---

<sup>18</sup> In this and the following sentences, the author alternates present and past tenses. For reasons of consistency, I have put the whole passage in the past tense.

<sup>19</sup> Epiphanius points to a well-known variant reading in John 19:14, where several witnesses read 'about the third hour' (ὥρα ... ὡς τρίτη) instead of 'about the sixth hour' (ὥρα ... ὡς ἕκτη). See B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Sec. Ed., 1994, Stuttgart / New York: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / United Bibel Societies, 216. However, 'the

should not tear asunder the harmony of the divine Gospels because of the destruction or addition of the letter. For look how the very wise Matthew exactly indicates the hour of the crucifixion by saying: 'And when they had come to the place called Golgotha, i.e. the place of the scull,'<sup>20</sup> and then, after the wine mingled with myrrh and the partition of the garments, adds: 'from the sixth hour darkness came over the entire world until the ninth hour,' and so on.<sup>21</sup> Some people are of the opinion that the holy Matthew says that he was crucified at the sixth hour, but the holy man was concerned with the darkness from the sixth hour.

So he was crucified, as said, on the day before the Sabbath at the third hour, and one day was accounted to him from the third to the sixth hour. For after the crucifixion he also performed the salvation of those who were in the underworld, and from the sixth to the ninth hour it was one night, and from the ninth hour to the evening it was one day, (and there was the night before dawn of the Sabbath). And so two days and two nights had passed. And during the whole of the Sabbath it was one day and then there was the night before dawn of the Day of the Lord. And the word that had been spoken about him was fulfilled: 'The Son of Man has to pass three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.'<sup>22</sup>

He was crucified at the third hour on the sixth day of the week, on the fourteenth according to the moon, the twenty-fourth of the month of Phamenoth, the thirteenth before the Kalends of April. For that reason we also fast on the day before the Sabbath. He rose on the Day of the Lord, as the cocks crowed, in the night of the equinox that is combined with a day of equal length, i.e. the twenty-sixth of the month of Phamenoth, which was Nisan among the Hebrews, translated as Pharmouth. The months of the Hebrews, however, as well as those of the happy<sup>23</sup> Athenians and the Lacedemonians, anticipate the months of the Egyptians by eight days, if it thus happens. It was the night that contains the same hours as the preceding day.

---

manuscript evidence is overwhelming in support of ἔκτῃ; the reading τρίτῃ was 'an obvious attempt to harmonize the chronology with that of Mk 15:25' (Metzger; see also his note on Mark 15:25 (p. 99), where in the same interest a few witnesses read ἔκτῃ instead of τρίτῃ).

<sup>20</sup> Matthew 27:34 f.

<sup>21</sup> Matthew 27:45.

<sup>22</sup> Matthew 12:40. This explanation of 'the three days and the three nights' is already found in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, 21 (cf. Vööbus's translation in CSCO 408, 190, 3–18).

<sup>23</sup> Holl, 'Bruchstück,' 207, crit. app. line 20, suggests that the unexpected word εὐδαιμόνων might be a scribal error for Μακεδόνων.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, F.I., '2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,' in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, 91–221.
- Aranda, G., 'Maria en los Evangelios Apócrifos Coptos,' *Scripta de Maria* 1 (1978) 115–126.
- , 'Maria en las narraciones coptas sobre el final de su vida en la tierra,' *Scripta de Maria* 2 (1979) 7–24;
- , 'Tradiciones marianas apócrifas en las homilias coptas del pseudo-Cirilo de Jerusalén: I. Origen e infancia de Maria, nacimiento de Jesus,' *Scripta de Maria* 4 (1981) 101–122;
- , 'Tradiciones marianas apócrifas en las homilias coptas del pseudo-Cirilo de Jerusalén: II. Resurreccion de Cristo, final de la vida de Maria,' *Scripta de Maria* 5 (1982) 29–50.
- Arras, V., *De transitu Mariae apocrypha Aethiopice*, II: *Cyrilli Hierosolymitani Homilia* (CSCO 351 [text], 352 [Latin transl.]), Louvain, CSCO, 1973–1974.
- Atiya, A.S., 'Ibn Kabar,' *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 4, 1267–1268.
- Atiya, A.S. (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, 8 vols., New York / Toronto / New York–Oxford–Singapore–Sydney: Macmillan Publishing Company / Collier Macmillan / Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- Bacot, S., 'Le "Chant de la vigne" en langue copte: Une nouvelle approche,' in A. Boud'hors and C. Louis (eds.), *Études Coptes XI. Treizième journée d'études* (Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte, 17), Paris: De Boccard, 2010, 201–211.
- Basset, R. (ed.), *Le Synaxaire arabe jacobite (rédaction copte)* (PO 1, 3), Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907.
- Bauckham, R.J., *Jude, 2 Peter* (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 50), Waco (Texas): Word Books, 1983.
- Baum, A.M., *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum, mit ausgewählten Quellentexten samt deutscher Übersetzung* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 138), Tübingen 2001.
- Baumgarten, J.M., '4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar,' *Revue de Qumran* 12 (1985/7) 399–407.
- Beck, H.-G., *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. XII, Byzantinisches Handbuch II, 1) München: Beck, 1959.
- Beckwith, R.T., 'The Essene Calendar and the Moon: A Reconsideration,' *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1992) 457–466.
- Bell, H.I., (ed.), *The Aphroditō Papyri, with an Appendix of Coptic Papyri*, edited by W.E. Crum (Greek Papyri in the British Museum. Catalogue, with Texts, vol. IV), London: British Museum, 1910.
- Belting, H., *Likeness and Presence. A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Bernardin, J.B., 'A Coptic Sermon Attributed to St. Athanasius,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1937) 113–129.

- , 'The Resurrection of Lazarus,' *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 57 (1940) 262–290.
- Beyers, R. (ed.), *Libellus de nativitate sanctae Mariae. Textus et commentarius* (CCA, 10), Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.
- Biedenkopf-Ziehner, A., *Koptische Ostraka, I: Ostraka aus dem Britischen Museum in London. Mit Einführung in das Formular der vorgelegten Urkunden*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.
- Bybliothecae Pierpont Morgan Codices Coptici Photographice Expressi*, 57 vols., Rome: Vatican City, 1922 (published by H. Hyvernat).
- Bombeck, S., 'Pseudo Kyrillos In Mariam Virginem: Text und Übersetzung von Pierpont Morgan M597 fols. 46–74,' *Orientalia* 70 (2001) 40–88.
- Bonwetsch, N., 'Die Mosesage in der slavischen kirchlichen Literatur,' *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philos.-Hist. Klasse, 1908, 581–607.
- Boud'hors, A., 'Le catalogage des textes coptes du Louvre,' in Emmel et al. (eds.), *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit*, II, 257–267.
- Bovon, F. et al., *Les actes apocryphes des apôtres. Christianisme et monde païen*, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1981.
- Breckenridge, J.D., *The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II (685–695, 705–711 A.D.)* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, 144), New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1959.
- Broek, R. van den, *The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (EPRO 24), Leiden 1972.
- , *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity* (NHMS, 39), Leiden, Brill, 1996.
- , *Gnostic Religion in Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- , 'An Early Chronology of Holy Week in Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem's On the Passion (Pierpont Morgan Library, M 610),' in Emmel et al. (eds.), *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit*, II, 101–108.
- , 'Der Bericht des koptischen Kyrillos von Jerusalem über das Hebräerevan-gelium' (1990), in idem, *Studies in Gnosticism*, 142–156.
- , 'Der Brief des Jakobus an Quadratus und das Problem der judenchristlichen Bischöfe von Jerusalem (Eusebius, HE IV, 5,1–3),' in T. Baarda, A. Hilhorst et al. (eds.), *Text and Testimony. Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1988, 56–65.
- , 'The Gnostic Christ,' in O. Hammer (ed.), *Alternative Christs*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 16–32.
- Budge, E.A.W., *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London: British Museum, 1913.
- , *Coptic Martyrdoms*, London: British Museum, 1914.
- , *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London: British Museum, 1915.
- Buzi, P., *Catalogo dei manoscritti copti Borgiani conservati presso la Biblioteca Nazionale "Vittorio Emanuele III" di Napoli, con un profilo scientifico di Stefano Bor-gia e Georg Zoega e una breve storia della formazione della collezione Borgiana* (Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Anno CDVI—2009, Classe di Scienze

- morali, storiche e filologiche, *Memorie*, Serie IX, vol. 25, fasc. 1), Roma: Scienze e Lettere, 2009.
- Campagnano, A., *Ps. Cirillo di Gerusalemme: Omelie copte sulla Passione, sulla Croce e sulla Vergine* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' Antichità, LXV), Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1980.
- , A. Maresca, and T. Orlandi (eds.), *Quattro omelie copte. Vita di Giovanni Crisostomo, Encomi dei 24 Vegliardi (Ps. Procle e Anonimo), Encomio di Michele Arcangelo di Eustazio di Tracia* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' Antichità, Serie Copta, 60), Milano, Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1977.
- Camplani, A., 'Epifanio (*Ancoratus*) e Gregorio di Nazianzo (*Epistulae*) in Copto: Identificazioni e Status Quaestionis,' *Augustinianum* 35 (1995) 327–347.
- Cecchelli, C., G. Furlani & M. Salmi (eds.), *The Rabbula Gospels. Facsimile Edition of the Miniatures of the Syriac Manuscript Plut. I, 56 in the Medicaean-Laurentian Library, edited and commented*, Olten & Lausanne: Urs Graf, 1959.
- Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser, I.-M., unter Mitarbeit von J. [M]. Diethart, *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter in der griechischsprachigen dokumentarischen Texten Ägyptens mit Berücksichtigung koptischer Quellen* (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrus-sammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer), Neue Serie, 27. Folge), fasc. I and II (Alpha-Delta), Vienna: Hollinek, 1996, 2000.
- Chadwick, H., *Origen: Contra Celsum. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953, reprinted with corrections 1965.
- Chaîne, M., 'Catéchèse attribuée à Saint Basile de Césarée. Une lettre apocryphe de Saint Luc,' *ROC* 23 (1922/23) 150–159 (text), 271–302 (French translation).
- , 'Sermon de Théodose patriarche d' Alexandrie sur la Dormition et l' Assomption de la Vierge,' *ROC* 29 (1933/34) 272–314.
- Chapman, P. (ed.), *Evodius of Rome, On the Passion and the Resurrection of the Lord*, in Depuydt, *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, CSCO 524, 79–106 (text), 525, 83–114 (transl.).
- Charlesworth, J.M., (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols., London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983 (reprint Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009).
- Choat, M., 'Thomas the "Wanderer" in a Coptic List of the Apostles,' *Orientalia* 74 (2005), 83–85.
- Collins, A.Y., *Mark. A Commentary* (Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible), Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007.
- Collins, J.J., 'Artapanus,' in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, 889–903.
- Coquin, R.E. & G. Godron, 'Un encomium copte sur Marie-Madeleine attribué à Cyrille de Jérusalem,' *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale*, 90 (1990) 169–212.
- Cramer, J.A. (ed.), *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum, VIII: In Epistolas Catholicas et Apocalypsin*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1844.
- Crum, W.E., *Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and Others*, London: The Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902.
- Crum, W.E. (ed.), *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI–VII der Philippsbibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften* (Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Straßburg, 18), Straßburg: K.J. Trübner, 1915.
- Crum, W.E., *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

- Crum, W.E. see also Bell, H.I.
- Daris, S. *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*, 2nd ed., Barcelona: Seminari de Papirologia, 1991.
- Delattre, A., 'Un nouveau témoin des listes d'apôtres apocryphes en copte,' *Orientalia* 79 (2010), 74–79.
- Denis, A.-M., *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graece* (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, III), Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Depuydt, L. (gen. ed.), *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library. Seven Coptic Homilies Attributed to Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and Euodius of Rome* (CSCO, vols. 524 [text] and 525 [translation]), Louvain: Peeters, 1991.
- (gen. ed.), *Encomiastica from the Pierpont Morgan Library. Five Coptic Homilies Attributed to Anastasius of Euchaita, Epiphanius of Salamis, Isaac of Antioch, Severian of Gabala and Theopompus of Antioch* (CSCO 544 [text] and 545 [translation]), Louvain: Peeters, 1993.
- Depuydt, L., *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts, Vol. 4), Louvain: Peeters 1993.
- , *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library: Album of Photographic Plates* (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts, Vol. 5), Louvain: Peeters, 1993.
- Detailed descriptions and additional bibliographies* (of the Mss. of the Pierpont Morgan Library), composed in 1947 and available at the website of the Library.
- Diethart, J., 'Zum Beitrag koptischer Texte der byzantinischen Zeit zur griechischen und lateinischen Lexikographie,' in W. Hörandner, J. Koder & M.A. Stassinopoulou (eds.), *Wiener Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik. Beiträge zum Symposium vierzig Jahre Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien, im Gedenken an Herbert Hunger* (Wien, 4–7 Dezember 2002) (Byzantina et Neograeca Vindobonensia, XXIV), Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004, 138–140.
- Dobschütz, E. von, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende* (TU, 18), Leipzig: Hirsch, 1899.
- Drioton, E., 'Un apocryphe anti-ariens: la version copte de la correspondance d'Abgar, roi d'Édesse, avec notre Seigneur,' *ROC* 20 (1915–1917) 306–326, 337–373.
- Drijvers, J.W., *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and the legend of her Finding of the True Cross*, Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri*, at [www.Papyri.info](http://www.Papyri.info).
- Dulaey, M. (ed.), *Victorin de Poetovio. Sur l'Apocalypse, suivi du Fragment chronologique et de La construction du monde* (SC 423), Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1997.
- Elliott, J.K., *The Apocryphal New Testament. A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Emmel, S. et al., *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996, Band 2: Schrifttum, Sprache und Gedankenwelt*, Wiesbaden 1999.
- Esbroeck, M. van, 'Les textes littéraires sur l'Assomption avant le X<sup>e</sup> siècle,' in Bovon, *Les actes apocryphes*, 265–285; reprinted in M. van Esbroeck, *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge. Études historiques sur les traditions orientales*, Aldershot, 1995, I.

- Evans, C.A., *Mark 8:27–16:20* (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 34B), Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- Fallon, F., 'Eupolemus,' in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, 861–872.
- Festugière, A.-J., *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, I: *L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris: Gabalda, 1944.
- Förster, H., *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten* (TU 148), Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Frend, W.H.C., *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Geyer, P., *Itinera Hierosolymitana, saeculi III–VIII* (CSEL, 39), Vienna: Tempsky, 1898.
- Gijssels, J. (ed.), *Pseudo-Matthaei Evangelium. Textus et commentarius* (CCA, 9), Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.
- Ginzburg, L., *Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols., Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–1938 (and later reprints).
- Giversen, S., (ed.), *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library. Facsimile Edition*, III, *Psalm Book*, Part I (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 16) Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1988.
- Görgemanns, H. & H. Karpp (eds), *Origenes: Vier Bücher von den Prinzipien*, [Texte zur Forschung, 24], Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
- Graf, G., *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, II: *Die Schriftsteller bis zur Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Studi e Testi, 133), Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1947.
- Haase, F., *Apostel und Evangelisten in den orientalischen Überlieferungen* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, IX, 1–3), Münster i. W.: Asschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.
- Hagen, J.L., 'The Diaries of the Apostles: "Manuscript Find" and "Manuscript Fiction" in Coptic Homilies and other Literary Texts,' in M. Immerzeel and J. van der Vliet (eds.), *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium*. Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies, Leiden, 27 augustus–2 September 2000 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 133), Louvain-Paris-Dudley, Ma: Uitgeverij Peeters and Departement Oosterse Studies, 2004, Vol. I, 349–365.
- Hanna W.A., *The Lamp that Lights the Darkness in Clarifying the Service*, [www.zeitun-eg.org/Ibn\\_Kabar](http://www.zeitun-eg.org/Ibn_Kabar).
- Hansen, G., *Theodoros Anagnostes: Kirchengeschichte* (GCS), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1971.
- Harnack, A. von, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II, 4. Aufl., Tübingen: Mohr, 1909 (reprinted Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964).
- Hasitzka, M.P.M., (ed.), *Koptisches Sammelbuch*, Vol. III (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrusammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Herzog Rainer), Neue Serie, XXIII. Folge, Band 3), München-Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2006.
- Haussleiter, J. (ed.), *Victorini Episcopi Petavionensis opera* (CSEL 49), Vienna/Leipzig: F. Tempski / G. Freitag, 1916.
- Holl, K. (ed.), *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, I: *Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1–33* (GCS 25), Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915; II: *Panarion haer. 34–64* (GCS 31), 2. bearbeitete Aufl., herausgegeben von J. Dummer, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1980;

- III: *Panarion haer. 65–80. De fide* (GCS 37), 2. bearbeitete Aufl., herausgegeben vom J. Dummer, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985.
- Holl, K., 'Ein Bruchstück aus einem unbekannten Brief des Epiphanius,' in idem *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, II: *Der Osten*, Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1928 (reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964, 204–224).
- Horner, G. (ed.), *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*, 7 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911–1924 (reprinted Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1969).
- Hyvernât, H., 'The J.P. Morgan Collection of Coptic Manuscripts,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 31 (1912) 54–57.
- , *A Check List of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, New York: Privately Printed [The Gillis Press], 1919.
- James, M.R., *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953 (corrected 1924 edition).
- , *Apocrypha anecdota*, II (Texts and Studies, 5, 1), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897.
- Jaubert, A., *La date de la Cène*, Paris: Lecoffre Gabalda, 1957.
- Junod, E. & J.-D. Kaestli, *Acta Johannis Textus alii—Commentarius—Indices* (CC, Series Apocryphorum, 2), Turnhout: Brepols, 1983.
- Junod, E., 'Polymorphie du Dieu-Sauveur,' in J. Ries (ed.), *Gnosticisme et Monde Hellenistique*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1982, 38–46.
- Kaestli, J.-D. & P. Cherix, *L'Évangile de Barthélemy d'après deux écrits apocryphes: I. Questions de Barthélemy, II. Livre de la Résurrection de Jésus-Christ par l'apôtre Barthélemy*, Turnhout: Brepols, 1993.
- Kasser, R., *Compléments au Dictionnaire Copte de Crum* (Bibliothèque d'Études Coptes, VII), Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1964.
- Kuhn, K.H. and W.J. Tait (eds.), *Thirteen Coptic Acrostic Hymns from Manuscript M574 of the Pierpont Morgan Library*, Oxford: The Griffith Institute-Ashmolean Museum, 1996.
- Lagarde, P. de, *Aegyptiaca*, Göttingen 1883 (reprint Osnabrück 1972).
- Lalleman, P.J., 'Polymorphy of Christ,' in J.N. Bremmer (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of John*, Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1995, 97–118.
- Lampe, G.W.H., 'Christian Theology in the Patristic Period,' in H. Cunliffe-Jones (ed.), *A History of Christian Doctrine*, Edinburgh: T.&T. Clarke, 1978, 21–180.
- Lampe, G.W.H. (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Lantschoot, A. van, 'A propos du Physiologus,' in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute, 2), Boston, Mass.: The Byzantine Institute, 1950, 339–363.
- , *Recueil des colophons des manuscrits chrétiens d'Égypte*, tome I: *Les colophons coptes des manuscrits sahidiques*, Fasc. 1: *Textes*, Fasc. 2: *Notes et tables* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 1), Louvain: J.-B. Ista, 1929.
- Latte, K., *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, I, Hauniae: Munksgaard, 1953.
- Layton, B., *A Coptic Grammar, with Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Band 20), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.

- , *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the Year 1906*, London: British Library, 1987.
- Lehman, S.M. (transl.), *Midrash Rabba—Exodus*, London & Bournemouth: Soncino Press, 1951.
- Lemm, O. von, *Kleine koptische studien, I–LVIII*. Unveränderter, um ein Vorwort von Peter Nagel, Halle/Saale, vermehrter Nachdruck der 1899–1910 in der Petersburger Akademie-Schriften erschienenen Stücke (Subsidia Byzantina, X), Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1972.
- Liddell, H.G. & R. Scott (eds), *A Greek-English Lexicon*. A New Edition, Revised and Augmented throughout by H.S. Jones & R. McKenzie, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Lipsius, R.A. & M. Bonnet (eds.), *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, I, Leipzig: H. Mendelssohn, 1891 (reprinted: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959).
- Lipsius, R.A., *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte*, I, Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1883.
- Lucchesi, E., 'D' une Vie de Marie à une Homélie sur la Passion,' *Analecta Bollandiana* 114 (1996) 269–272.
- , 'L'homélie copte acéphale en l'honneur des XXIV vieillards,' *Analecta Bollandiana* 117 (1999), 289–290.
- Maher, M. (transl.), *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus* (The Aramaic Bible, Vol. 2), Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Mallon, A., *Grammaire copte. Bibliographie, chrestomathie et vocabulaire*, 4ème éd., revue par M. Malinine, Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1956.
- Mara, M.G. (ed.), *Evangile de Pierre* (SC 201), Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1973.
- Marcovich, M., *Origenes: Contra Celsum, Libri VIII* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. LIV), Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Metzger, M. (ed.), *Les Constitutions apostoliques*, 3 vols. (SC 320, 329, 336), Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985–1987.
- Mimouni, S.M., *Dormition et Assomption de Marie. Histoire des traditions anciennes* (Théologie Historique, 98), Paris: Beauchesne, 1995.
- Morenz, S., *Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann* (TU 56), Berlin-Leipzig 1951.
- Müller, C.D.G., *Die alte koptische Predigt (Versuch eines Überblicks)*, Thesis Ruprecht-Karl University Heidelberg, 1954.
- Nock, A.D. & A.-J. Festugière (eds.), *Corpus hermeticum*, I, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946 (and later reprints).
- Orlandi, T., 'Cirillo di Gerusalemme nella letteratura copta,' *Vetera Christianorum* 9 (1972) 93–100.
- , 'Coptic Literature,' in B.A. Pearson & J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, 51–81.
- , 'Cycle,' in *Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 3, 666–668.
- , 'Patristica copta et patristica greca,' *Vetera Christianorum* 10 (1973) 327–341.
- Painchaud, L., *L'Écrit sans titre. Traité sur l'origine du monde* (NH II, 5 et Brit. Lib. Or. 4926[1]) (Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, Section "Textes," 21), Quebec-Louvain: Les Presses de l'Université Laval—Éditions Peeters, 1995.
- Petersen T.C., *Coptic Bindings in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, unpublished study finished ca. 1948, typescript kept at the Pierpont Morgan Library.



- Pleše, Z. (ed.), *John Chrysostom, On the Resurrection and the Apostles*, in Depuydt (gen. ed.), *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, CSCO 524, 56–76 (text), 525, 57–80 (transl.).
- Pummer, R., *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism: Texts, Translations and Commentary* (Text and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 92), Tübingen: Mohr, 2002.
- Revillout, E., *Les apocryphes coptes*, Première partie (PO, II, 2), Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907, 123–198 [7–82].
- Ri, S.-M., *La Caverne des trésors: Les deux recensions syriaques* (CSCO 486 [text] and 487 [translation]), Louvain: Peeters, 1987.
- Robinson, A., *St. Irenaeus. The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, Translated from the Armenian with Introduction and Notes*, London / New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge / The MacMillan Co., 1920.
- Robinson, F., *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels. Translations with the Text of Some of Them* (Texts and Studies, IV, 2), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- Rouwhorst, G.A.M., *Les hymnes pascales d'Ephrem de Nisibe. Analyse théologique et recherche sur l'évolution de la fête pascale chrétienne à Nisibe et à Edessa et dans quelques Églises voisines au quatrième siècle*, 2 vols. (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, VII, 1/2), Leiden 1989.
- Samir, S. Kh. (ed.), *Ibn Kabar, Abu-al-Barakat, Misbah al-zulma fi idah al khidma*, vol. I, Cairo: Maktabat al-Karuz, 1971.
- Santos Otero, A. de (ed.), *Los Evangelios Apocrifos*, Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 1956.
- Schermann, Th. (ed.), *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae. Indices apostolorum discipulorumque domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicata*, Lipsiae: Teubner, 1907.
- Schermann, Th., *Propheten- und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte* (TU, 31, 3), Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1907.
- Schneemelcher, W. (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, II: *Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*, 3. Aufl., Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
- Shoemaker, S.J., *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- , 'Rethinking the Gnostic Mary: Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9 (2001) 555–595.
- , 'The Sahidic Coptic Homily on the Dormition of the Virgin Attributed to Evodius of Rome,' *AB* 117 (1999) 241–283.
- Smith Lewis, A., *The Mythological Acts of the Apostles* (Horae Semiticae, IV), London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1904.
- Sophocles, E.A., *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from BC 146 to AD 1100)*, 2 vols., New York: F. Ungar, 1957 (= Cambridge, Mass.–London: Harvard University Press–Oxford University Press, 1887 and 1914).
- Speyer, W., *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike, mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Hypomnemata, 24), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- , *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I, 2), München, 1971.

- Story, C.I.K., 'A Coptic Christmas Story, and More,' *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 55 (1993–1994) 45–62.
- Strobel, A., *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders* (TU, 121), Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977.
- Stroumsa, G.G., 'Polymorphie divine et transformations d'un mythologème: L'Apo-cryphon de Jean et ses sources' (1981), in idem, *Savoir et salut*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1992, 43–63.
- Suciu, A., 'The Borgian Coptic Manuscripts in Naples: Supplementary Identifications and Notes to a Recently Published Catalogue,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 77 (2011) 299–325.
- Thompson, H., *A Coptic Palimpsest Containing Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith and Esther*, London: H. Frowde—Oxford University Press, 1911.
- , *The Coptic Version of Certain Books of the Old Testament*, London: H. Frowde—Oxford University Press, 1908.
- Till, W.C., *Koptische Dialektgrammatik, mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch*, 2. Aufl., München: C.H. Beck, 1961.
- , *Koptische Grammatik*, 4th ed., Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1970.
- Tischendorf, C., *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 2d. ed., Leipzig: Menselssohn 1876 (reprinted Hildesheim: Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966).
- Tromp, J., 'Origen on the Assumption of Moses,' in F. García Martínez & G.P. Lut-tikhuijsen (eds.), *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interac-tion in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 82), Leiden: Brill, 2003, 323–340.
- , *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, X), Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Ullmann, M., *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache*, vol I, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970.
- Vaganay, L., *L'Évangile de Pierre*, Paris: Gabalda et Fils, 1930.
- Villecourt, L. (ed.), *Livre de la Lampe des ténèbres et de l'exposition (lumineuse) du service (de l'Eglise)* (PO 20, 4), Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1929.
- Vis, H. de, (ed.), *Homélies coptes de la Vaticane. Texte copte publié et traduit* (Coptica I), Haunia: Gyldendalske Boghandel-Nordisk Forlag, 1922.
- Vögtlin, A. (ed.), *Vita beate Virginis Marie et Salvatoris Rhythmica* (Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins zu Stuttgart, 180), Stuttgart: Literarischer Verein, 1888.
- Vööbus, A. (ed.), *The Didascalia in Syriac* (CSCO 401/407 [text], 402/408 [English translation]), Louvain: CSCO, 1979.
- W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1909 (reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967).
- Waldstein, M & F. Wisse, *The Apocryphon of John. Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, 1; III, 1; IV, 1 with BG 8502, 1* (NHMS 33), Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Wansink, C.S. (ed.), *Encomium on the Four Bodiless Living Creatures*, in Depuydt (ed.), *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library*, CSCO 524, 27–46 (text), 525, 27–47 (transl.).
- Weitzmann, K., *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai: The Icons*, Vol. I: *From the Sixth to the Tenth Century*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976.

- Wellmann, M., *Pedani Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1907.
- Wessel, K., *Koptische Kunst. Die Spätantike in Ägypten*, Recklinghausen: Aurel Bongers, 1963.
- Westendorf, W., *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 2. Aufl., Heidelberg: Winter-Universitätsverlag, 2008.
- Westerhoff, M., *Auferstehung und Jenseits im koptischen "Buch der Auferstehung Jesu Christi, unseres Herrn"* (Orientalia Biblica et Christiana, 11), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- Whitting, P.D., *Byzantine Coins*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1973.
- Wilkinson, J., *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land. Newly translated with supporting documents and notes*, rev. ed., Jerusalem / Warminster: Ariel Publishing House / Aris & Phillips, 1981.
- Williams, F., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III (Sects 47–80, De Fide)* (NHMS 36), Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Windisch, H.-H. Preisker, *Die Katholischen Briefe*, 3. stark umgearbeitete Aufl. (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 15), Tübingen: Mohr, 1951.
- Worrell, W.H., *The Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection* (University of Michigan Studies, Hum. Series, X), New York–London: Macmillan, 1923.
- Wurst, G., 'Die Bedeutung der manichäischen Sonntagsfeier (Manichäisches Psalmenbuch I, 127),' in Emmel et al. (eds.), *Ägypten und Nubien*, II, 563–580.

## INDEX OF GRAECO-COPTIC WORDS

Numbers in roman type refer to sections of Pseudo-Cyril's homily (pp. 124–181); those in italics refer to pages of this book.

- ἀγάπη, 162  
 ἄγγελος, 6  
 ἄγια, 102  
 [εἰσαγία], 4  
 ἀγνώμων, 3  
 ἄγών, 10, 20 (2 ×), 186  
 ἀδίκως [ἀδικος], 118  
 ἀετός, 38, 141 (2 ×), 142 (3 ×), 144, 145, 148,  
     151, 152, 153 (3 ×), 154, 155  
 ἀθετεῖν [ἀθετεῖ], 33  
 αἰτεῖν [αἰτεῖ], 136  
 αἰτία, 31  
 αἰχμαλωσία [οἰκμαλωσία], 85  
 αἰών, 107, 163 (..x)  
 ἀληθώς, 65, 76, 77, 10, 132, 138  
 ἄλλα, 11, 15, 7, 21, 29, 3, 42, 64, 70, 94, 95,  
     9, 100, 101 (3 ×), 102 (2 ×), 106 (2 ×),  
     108, 110, 115, 128 [2x]), 132, 152, 157,  
     159  
 ἀλλόφυλος, 113  
 ἀμελεῖν [ἀμελεῖ], 42  
 ἀμέλει, 102  
 ἀμὴν [εἰρημην], superscription, 9, 61(2 ×),  
     163, colophon  
 ἀνάστασις, 6, 49 (2 ×), 96, 152, 102  
 ἀναχωρεῖν [ἀναχωρεῖ], 135, 138  
 ἀναχώρησις, 130  
 ἀνέχειν / ἀνέχεσθαι [ἀνιχε], 33, 116, 126,  
     128  
 ἀντιοχευς [ἀντιοχευς], 185, 186  
 ἀντιπάθεια [ἀντιπαθεῖ], 119  
 ἄπιστος, 41  
 ἀπλώς, 73, 134  
 ἀπὸ μέρους, 16, 71  
 ἀπόστολος, 1α, 4, 5 (2 ×), 7 (2 ×), 9, 10, 66,  
     71, 76, 87, 88, 89, 96, 101, 156, 186  
 ἀπρίλλιος [ἀπριλιος], 159  
 ἄρα, 100  
 ἀργυρόηλος / ἀργυρήλατος ? [ἀγρογλλε],  
     114  
 ἀρνεῖσθαι [ἀρνη], 160  
 ἀρχάγγελος, 102  
 ἀρχάγγελος, colophon (2 ×)  
 ἀρχαιολογία [ἀρχηολογία], 94 (2x), 101, 118  
 [ἀρχηολογία], 94, 118  
 ἀρχαῖος (-ων), 109  
 ἀρχεῖν [ἀρχεῖ], 1 (2 ×), 80, 111, 133, *n.* 31  
 ἀρχή, 2, 52, 153  
 ἀρχιεπίσκοπος [ἀρχιεπισκοπος],  
     superscription, 107  
 ἀρχιερεὺς, 21, 32 (2 ×), 34, 36, 51, 61, 66,  
     74, 91, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105 (2 ×), 109,  
     111, 112, 119, 131, 136  
 ἀρχιπρεσβύτερος [ἀρχηπρῆς], colophon  
 ἀρχισυνάγωγος [ἀρχησυναγωγος], 24  
 ἄρχων, 32, 33, 38, 111  
 ἀσκεῖν [ἀσκει], 73  
 ἀσπασμός, 97  
 ἀσώματος, 139  
 βαθμός, 106 (2 ×)  
 βαπτίζειν [βαπτίζει], 148  
 βάπτισμα, 12, 13, 112, 148  
 βασανίζειν [basanize], 94  
 βασίλικός, 24  
 βήμα, 160  
 βίος, 74, 117  
 γαζοφυλάκιον [κασοφγλακιον], 30, 135, *n.* 40  
 γάρ, 17, 23, 40, 66, 74, 80, 103, 106, 108, 143  
 γενεά, 16, 92, 94  
 γενεαλογία [κενεαλοκεια], 109  
 [κενεολογία], 94  
 γένος, 22, 113, 117, 151  
 γραμματεὺς, 61, 133, *n.* 31

- δαιμόνιον, 26 (3×)  
 δέ, superscription, 8, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21,  
 29, 30, 31, 32, 34 (2×), 35, 40, 42, 46,  
 48, 50, 51, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 68, 76,  
 78, 81 (2×), 82 (2×), 84, 86, 89, 93, 96,  
 98, 99, 104 (2×), 109, 111 (2×), 114, 118,  
 123 (2×), 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 139  
 (2×), 143, 163  
 διάβολος, 30, 70, 102 (2×)  
 διαθήκη, 151  
 διακονεῖν [ΔΑΙΚΟΝΕΙ], 137, 185  
 διάκονος, 7, 8  
 διατροπή, 100  
 διάτυπος, 100  
 διδασκαλία, 1α  
 διδάσκαλος [ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΩΣ], 34  
 διώκειν [ΔΙΩΚΕΙ], 57  
 δοκιμή, 16  
 δράκων, 84  
 δύναμις, 94, 97  
 [ΤΥΝΑΜΙΣ], 93  
 δῶρον, 22
- έβδομάς [ΕΒΔΟΜΑΣ], 93  
 έβραϊκος [ΕΒΡΑΙΚΟΝ], 106  
 έβραϊός [ΕΒΡΑΙΟΣ], 141  
 [ΕΒΡΑΙΟΣ], 1, 53, 57, 59, 141, 151 (2×)  
 [ΕΒΡΕΟΣ], 59  
 έθνος [ΕΘΝΟΣ], 34, 51, 115, 117, 132  
 εί μή τι [ΕΙΜΗΤΕΙ], 109  
 [ΕΙΜΗΤΕΙ], 43, 74, 126  
 [ΕΙΜΗΤΙ], 2 (2×)  
 είδωλον, 148  
 είρηνη, 1α, 9, 15, 97 (2×), 124  
 είτα, 76  
 εκατοντάρχος [ΕΚΑΤΟΝΤΑΡΧΗΣ], 24  
 έκκλησία, 5, 152  
 έλάχιστος, 110, 162, 165, *n.* 146  
 ένάγειν [ΕΝΕΓΓΕ], 135  
 έξήγησις [ΕΞΗΚΗΣΙΣ], superscription  
 έπαρχία, 18 (2×)  
 έπαρχος, 109  
 έπειδή [ΕΠΙΔΗ], 75, 111, 119, 136  
 επενδύτης [ΕΠΕΝΔΥΤΗΣ], 90  
 έπιθυμείν [ΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ], 2, 80, 123, 125  
 έπιθυμία, 80  
 έπισκοπεῖον [ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΝ], 8
- έπισκοπος, 8  
 έπιστολή, 120 (2×), 127, 136  
 έργατης, 184  
 έρμηνεύειν [ΕΡΜΗΝΕΥΕ], 118  
 εύαγγελίζειν [ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΖΕ], 17  
 εύαγγέλιον, 21, 29  
 εύαγγελιστής, 21, 157
- ήγεμών [ΗΓΕΜΩΝ], 40, 111 (3×), 113 (2×),  
 114, 115, 131, 133  
 ήγούμενος [ΗΓΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ], 40  
 ήμέρα [ΗΜΕΡΑ], 4, 82 (2×)  
 ήνίοχος [ΗΝΙΟΧΟΣ], 20 (2×), 185, 186  
 ήσυχία [ΕΣΥΧΙΑ], 118
- θάλασσα, 26, 27  
 θερμός, 99  
 θεσμός [ΘΥΣΜΟΣ], 108, 156  
 θλίψις, 74  
 θυσιαστήριον, superscription, 125, *n.* 3
- ίεροφάντης [ΙΕΡΟΦΑΝΤΗΣ], 102
- καίπερ, 102  
 καιρός, 51  
 κακή, 123, 160  
 κακώς, 91, 92  
 καλώς, 95  
 κᾶν, 119 (2×)  
 κανδήλη [ΚΑΝΔΥΛΑΣ], 75  
 καρπός, 142  
 κατά, 5, 10, 21, 22, 31, 36, 44, 53, 129, 157,  
 161  
 καταργεῖν [ΚΑΤΑΡΓΕΙ]  
 κατήγησις [ΚΑΘΗΓΗΣΙΣ], 162, 163  
 κατηγορεῖν [ΚΑΤΟΙΚΟΡΕΙ], 115  
 κατηγορία, 127  
 [ΚΑΤΟΙΚΟΡΙΑ], 126  
 καύσων, 63  
 κελεύειν [ΚΕΛΕΥΕ], 112, 115  
 κεραννύναι [ΚΕΡΑ], 82, 84  
 κεφαλή, 123, 160  
 κόλασις, 94  
 κόλλυβον [ΚΟΛΥΜΒΟΝ], 60  
 κολοβός, 73  
 κολυμβήθρα, 6  
 [ΚΟΛΟΜΒΥΘΡΑ], 140

- [κολονβηθρα], 148  
 [κολονβηθρα], 6  
 κόσμος, 10, 52, 56, 80 (2 ×), 97, 133 (2 ×),  
 140, 144, 184  
 κρίνειν [κρίνει], 111 (2 ×), 118  
 κυκλευτής [κεκλευτής], 10 (2 ×), 21, 28,  
 32, 186  
 [κγκλευτής], 185, 186  
 κυριακή, 96, 88  
 κυρίως [κγριος], 12, 79  
 κωλύειν, 147  
 κωμαριτής [κομαριτής], 10, 22–25, 31, 185  
 κωμάριον [κομαριον], 23–24
- λαμπάς, 85  
 λάός, superscription, 8, 22, 32, 33, 34, 40,  
 41, 61, 64, 68, 75, 109, 119, 125, 129 (2 ×),  
 130, 142, 150, 152  
 λατόμος [λατωμή], 28  
 λεγεών, 26  
 λειψίτης [λεγειτής], 59  
 λοιπόν, 7, 23, 36 (2 ×), 75, 118, 126, 135,  
 158  
 λόγος, 110  
 λυπεῖν [λγπει], 70, 83  
 λυπεῖν [λγπιη], 47, 70, 80 (2 ×), 138  
 λύπη, 88, 159, 161
- μάθημα, 159  
 μαθητής, 47, 48, 53, 59, 67, 75, 81 (4 ×), 84,  
 86, 98, 99, 184  
 μακάριος, 185  
 μαργαρίτης, 133, *n. 30*  
 μάρτυρος, 155  
 μάστιξ [μαστιγξ], 60  
 μέγεθος [μεγεθος], 112  
 μέλειν [μελει], 98  
 μέμβρανον [μεβρανον], 7  
 μερίς, 141  
 μέρος, 130, *n. k*  
 μέτρον, 111  
 μή, 40, 61, 115  
 μόγεις, 7  
 μονογενής, 109  
 μορφή, 73, 75, 79, 114, 117  
 μυρίκη [μερικης], 93
- νήφειν [νηφει], 139  
 νόημα, 147  
 νομοδιδάσκαλος [νομοδιδασκαλως], 34  
 νόμος, 22, 31, 32, 33, 41 (3 ×), 61, 68, 69,  
 105, 106, 119, 125, 129  
 νοτάριος [νοταριος], 106
- οἰκονομεῖν [οικονομει], 101  
 ὀλοκαύτωμα [ρολοκαγτωμα], 22  
 ὄλως [ρολως], 42, 98  
 ὁμιλεῖν [ρομελει], 108  
 ὁμοίως [ρομαιως], 82  
 ὁμοούσιος [ρομοουσιον], 163  
 ὄντως, 91  
 ὄραμα [ροραμα], 140, 142, 143, 146, 147  
 οὐδέ, 11 (2 ×), 94, 103, 111 (2 ×)  
 οὖν, 8, 49, 113, 115
- πάλιν, 80  
 πάντως, 17  
 πάπυρος [(π)απηρ(ος)], 102  
 παρά, superscription, 144  
 παράβασις, 2  
 παράγειν [παραγε], 13  
 παράδεισος [παραδεικος], 2, 58  
 παραδιδόναι [παραδιδουγ], 30, 64, 65, 66  
 (2 ×), 72, 75, 87  
 παρακαλεῖν [παρακαλει], superscription  
 [παρακαλι], colophon  
 παράκλητος, 11  
 παράπτωμα, 106  
 παρασκευή, 93  
 παρθένος, 35, 157, 105  
 παριστάναι [παριστα], 119  
 πάσχα, superscription, 46, 80, 81, 86, 93,  
 163, 79  
 πατάσσειν [πατασσει], 100 (3 ×)  
 πατριάρχης, 1  
 πείθειν [πιθει], 129, 131 (2 ×), 136  
 πειρασμός [πιρασμος], 88  
 πεντηχοστή, 6, 96  
 περισπᾶν [περιспа], 63  
 πηγή [πηγη], superscription  
 πιστεύειν [πιστευει], 19, 31 (2 ×), 41, 44, 50,  
 51, 113, 115, 148, 119  
 πίστις, 44, 45, 141, *n. 52*  
 πιστός, 18, 33, 111, colophon

- πλάνος, 116  
 πλὴν, 15, 21 (2 ×), 113  
 πληροφορεῖν [πληροφορεῖ], 77  
 πνεῦμα, 6, 11, 17, 37, 43, 151, 163  
 πολεμάρχης [πολυμαρχης], 75, 133  
 πολεμικός [πολυμικον], 75  
 πόλεμος, 102  
 πόλις, 4, 17, 18 (2 ×), 19 (3 ×), 37, 57 (2 ×),  
     111, 113, 117, 127, 166, *n. f*  
 πράξις, 5  
 πρεσβύτερος, 8  
 προαίρεσις [προαιρεσις], 107, 137  
 προδότης [προδοτης], 7, 15  
     [προδοτης], 91  
 προκόπτειν [προκοπτει], 42  
 πρὸς, 116, 156  
 πρόσωπον [προσωπον], 106  
 προφητεύειν, 136  
 προφήτης, 40, 41 (2 ×), 56, 61 (2 ×), 102, 111,  
     136, 151, 145, *n. 73*  
 ῥαββί, 75  
 σάββατον, 29, 67, 72, 82, 95, 96, 104  
     (2 ×), 108, 113, 127, 128, 134, 158,  
     159  
 σαρκικός, 110  
 σημείον [σημιον], 8  
     [σημιων], 7  
 σινδόνιον [σινδαλων], 114  
 σκανδαλίζειν [σκανδαλιζε], 83  
 σκάνδαλον, 55  
 σκηνοπηγία [σκηνοπηγια], 45  
 σκοτεύειν [σκοτεγε], 110  
 σκοτοῦν [σκοθοῦ], 109, 163, *n. 145*  
 σπαθὴ [σπαθα], 114  
 σπήλαιον, 60  
 στασιαστής, 132  
 σταυρός [cϣoc], 126, 136 (2 ×), 153, 102  
 σταυροῦν [cϣoy], 54, 136, 138, 157  
 στερέωμα, 1  
 στρατεύειν [στρατεγε], 133  
 στῦλος [cτγλλoc], 78  
 συζητεῖν [cγнζητει], 6  
 συναγωγή, 31, 32 (2 ×), 111, 112  
 σύναξις, 78  
 σύνταγμα, superscription, 4, 7, 11, 12  
 σώμα, 78, 92, 157 (2 ×), 114  
 σωτήρ, superscription, 6, 12, 19, 23, 31, 78,  
     79 (2 ×), 108, 110 (2 ×), 158, 162, 79  
 τάξις, 106  
 τάφος, 49, 50 (2 ×), 61, 154, 157  
 τέλος, 19, 185  
 τελώνης, 10, 185  
 τελώνιον, 20  
 τετράρχης [τετραρχης], 119  
 τέχνη, 10  
 τέχνη, 106  
 τιμή, 3, 95  
 τίμιος, 102  
 τολμάν [τολονα], 162  
 τολμηρία, 31  
 τομάριον [τωμαριον], 11  
 τόμος, 102  
 τότε, 14, 39, 44, 47, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58,  
     61, 67, 71, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 91, 105  
     (2 ×), 112, 115, 116, 117, 119, 124, 135, 138,  
     146  
 τράπεζα, 60, 134  
 τριαδικόν, 12  
 τριάς, 163  
 τρίκλινον, 132  
 τρυγών [τρικον], 22 (2 ×)  
 τρυφή, 2  
 ὑδρωπικός [γγтpопkос], 28  
 ὑπηρέτης [γγпepεтнc], 126, 160  
 φαкиάλιον [φακιαριον], 90  
 φονεύς [φωνεγc], 2  
 φόνος, 101, 102  
 φορεῖν [φορει], 148  
 φραγέλλη [φραγελλε], 109  
 φυλή, 69  
 φωνή, 131  
 χαίρε, 75  
     [xepe], 166, *n. f*  
 χάρις, 119  
 χάριτης, 102, 119, 124  
 χείμαρρος [χинаpос], 81  
 χειροτονεῖν [χιpоd.онeи], 8  
 χήρα, 24, 36

χρεία [x(p)ia], 109

χρεώς, 157

χρήμα, 45

χριστιανός [xphstianoc], 163

χριστός, 106, 107

χρόνος, 2 (2 ×)

χώρα, 6, 18(2 ×), 141

ψήφισμα [ΨΥΦΙCMA], 8

ψυχή, 47, 83, 92

ὦ, 33, 38 (2 ×), 57 (2 ×), 58, 80, 83, 92

(3 ×), 94, 97 (2 ×), 102, 107, 108, 110,

137, 144, 147, 152, 154 (2 ×), 159, 163

ὡς [xwc], 18, 22, 70, 111, 119, 128

ὥστε [xwcce], 51



## INDEX OF SOURCES

### 1. *Biblical Texts*

Genesis		Numbers	
1:5	44	9:1–5	104
1:26	143	9:6 ff.	149
1:28	143	9:12	118
2:21–22	109	21:8–9	99
3:6	127	28:17	149
3:23	127		
3:24	127	Deuteronomy	
9:7	143	16:3 ff.	149
15:13	147	16:8	149
30:28–43	125	19:15	91
31:12	125		
37:3	125	2 Samuel	
37:23	125	2:13	99
Exodus		Job	
2:11–15	65	4:9	115
2:12	66, 161		
12	100, 104	Psalms	
12:8	118, 149	23 (LXX):7–10	83
12:15 ff.	149	44 (LXX):3	59
12:17	149	69:26	157
12:50–51	149	83:6–19	84
15:20–21	80	102:9	179
15:21	77	108 (LXX):7–8	84
23:14	100	108 (LXX):9–17	84
23:15	149	109:8	159
24	52	116:15	91
33–34	52	117 (LXX):19–20	83
34:18	149	118 (LXX):103	115
Leviticus		Song of Songs	
1:17	133	5:10 (LXX)	59
10:6	161	5:11 (LXX)	60, 61
12:6	133		
14:10–34	133	Isaiah	
21:10	161	11:4	115
		26:2–4	83
		29:11	92
		29:18–20	91

Jeremiah		15:32–39	37, 107
4:12	99	16:17	19
Daniel		16:18–19	91
6:18 (LXX)	89	16:21	143, 145
Bel and the Dragon		16:22–23	145
3:1–39	89	17:1–9	52
Micah		17:2	52
5:1	74, 139	17:22	143
Zechariah		17:23	145
3:2–5	68	17:24–27	133
11:12 ff.	187	17:6–8	52
Judith		18:3	90
10:3	60	18:16	91
Matthew		19:26	89
1:18	128	19:27	131
2:6	139	20:18	143
4:18 ff.	26	20:19	145
4:18	131	20:29–34	37
4:18–20	131	21:8	135
4:18–22	19	21:12	145
4:19	131	21:12–13	147
4:21	131	21:46	41, 143
4:21–22	131	22:2	30
5:17	91	22:7	69
8:28–34	37	23:29	147
8:5–13	37	23:37	145
9:18–19	37	24:30	100
9:23–25	37	25:21	4
9:20–22	37	25:23	4
9:2–8	37	26:2	187
9:9	29, 133	26:3–5	41
10:3	27	26:14–16	84
11:28	133	26:15	41, 149
11:29	133	26:16	41, 135
11:30	133	26:24	157
12:9–14	37	26:26	159
12:40	189	26:27	155
13:45	133	26:30	155
13:52	115	26:31	155
14:15–21	37	26:36–46	84, 155
14:22–33	37	26:38	155
		26:39	155
		26:47–50	84
		26:47	151, 155
		26:48–49	84
		26:48	151
		26:49	151, 155

Matthew (*Cont.*)

26:50	155
26:51-54	159
26:52	161
26:55	55
26:56-57	159
26:63	161
26:63-64	161
26:65	161, 163
26:67	163
26:69-75	84, 179
27:3	135
27:5	157
27:9	135, 187
27:15 ff.	171
27:17	173
27:20	171
27:34 f.	189
27:45	175, 189
27:57-60	107
28:7	86
28:11-15	86

## Mark

1:16	131
1:16-18	131
1:16-20	19
1:19-20	131
1:20	131
2:1-12	37
2:14	29, 133
3:1-6	37
3:16-18	129
3:17	177
5:1-20	37
5:22-24	37
5:25-34	37
6:35-44	37, 106
6:45-52	37
8:1-9	37
8:1-10	107
8:31	145
9:2-10	52
9:31	143, 145
10:28	131
10:33	143
10:34	145

11:8	135
11:15	145
11:15-17	147
12:12	143
12:41	135
12:43	135
12:42-43	92
13:3	129
14:21	157
14:26	155
14:32-42	155
14:34	155
14:35	155
14:43	151, 154
14:44-45	84
14:44	151
14:45	155
14:47	159
14:50	159
14:53	159
14:62	161
14:65	163
14:66-72	84, 179
15:6 ff.	171
15:7	38
15:11	171
15:25	189
15:33	175
15:34-35	119
16:7	86
16:8	107
16:9	37

## Luke

2:25 ff.	139
5:1-11	19
5:18-26	37
5:27	29
5:27-28	133
5:32	92
6:15	16
6:16	16
6:21	153
6:6-11	37
7:1-10	37
7:11-17	37
8:2	37

8:6-39	37	1:45	19, 20
8:40-42	37	2:1-12	30
8:43-48	37	2:12	145
8:49-56	37	2:14	147
9:12-17	37	2:15	147
9:22	145	3:1	137
9:28-36	52	3:2	141
9:44	143, 145	3:5	141
9:9	169	3:10	137
11:53	133	4:46-54	37
14:1-6	135	5:1-15	37, 135
14:2	37	5:2-9	6
18:28	131	6:1-13	106
18:31	143	6:16-21	37
18:33	145	6:9	107
19:36	135	6:38-39	153
19:45	145	6:70	149
19:45-46	147	7:1-2	141
19:48	41, 143	7:41	139
20:19	143	7:50	139
21:1	135	7:50-51	139
21:2-3	92	8:1	135
22:14	155	8:51-59	147
22:15	153	9:1-12	37
22:20	153	11:4	141
22:39	155	11:11	141
22:40-46	155	11:12	141
22:48	84, 157	11:15	141
22:49-51	159	11:17	143
22:54-62	84, 179	11:19	141
22:54	159	11:21	141
22:71	163	11:22	141
23:6	167	11:24-25	141
23:7	167	11:32	141
23:9	169	11:34	141
23:12	169	11:39	143
23:13-53	80	11:43-44	143
23:17 ff.	171	11:45	143
23:44	175	11:46-53	143
23:46	175	12:1	141
24:13-35	89	12:6	135
24:49	129	13:1	83, 153, 155
		13:33	153
John		14:19	153
1:1	80	16:16	153
1:11	153	16:28	153
1:42	19	18:3	151, 155

John ( <i>Cont.</i> )		21:15-19	19, 91
18:8	84	21:22-23	91
18:10	84	21:25	131
18:1-2	153		
18:10-11	159	Acts	
18:12	159	1:4	129
18:12-24	84	1:9	173
18:15-17	179	1:13	16, 129
18:17	84	1:15-26	159
18:22	179	1:16	129
18:25-27	84, 179	1:18	157
18:33-35	167	1:20	159
18:39 f.	171	1:26	30
19:14	188	5:1-12	66
19:26-27	85	12:1-9	127
19:28	78	12:12	127
19:30	78		
19:31-34	85	1 Corinthians	
19:38-41	107	11:25	153
19:38-42	177	15:5-8	80
19:39-42	114	15:6	89
20:1-18	75	15:9	165
20:3-10	108		
20:6-7	80	2 Corinthians	
20:11-18	85, 145, 177	13:1	91
20:11	108		
20:11-12	107	Ephesians	
20:14-18	108	3:8	165
20:15	24		
20:15-17	80	2 Thessalonians	
20:17	88, 108	2:8	115
20:19	88, 89, 127		
20:23	19, 89	Hebrews	
20:24-29	80, 92	10:31	92
20:25	89		
20:26-29	89	Jude	
20:30	131	4	67
21:5	90	9	67, 68
21:7	90		
21:1-14	90	Revelation	
21:11	91	10:1	52
21:12	91	22:15	69
21:1-8	19		

2. Greek and Latin Texts

<i>Acta Perpetuae et Felicitatis</i>		<i>De fide</i> , 22, 13	48
10	52	<i>Letter on the Chronology of Holy Week</i>	
<i>Acta Thaddaei</i> , 1	27		39, 43–48
<i>Acts of John</i> , 88–89	56		<i>passim</i> , 50,
<i>Acts of Peter</i> , 20 and 21	55		186–189
<i>Acts of Pilate</i>		Epiphanius (Ps.-)	
1, 1	36, 37, 38	<i>Index apostolorum discipulorumque</i> ,	
2, 3	38	13–15	14
2, 6	36	Epiphanius Monachos	
4, 2	36	<i>Vita Deiparae</i>	57, 59
9, 1	38	Eupolemus	
<i>Acts of Thomas</i> , 39	21	<i>On the Kings in Judea</i> , frg. 1	
<i>Anaphora of Pilate</i> , 1–5	36		65–66
Andrew of Crete		Eusebius	
<i>De sanctarum imaginum veneratione</i>	62	<i>Praeparatio Evangelica</i>	
Antoninus of Piacenza		IX, 9, 26, 1	66
<i>Itinerarium</i>		IX, 27, 18	65
17	153	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>	
23	61	IV, 5, 1–4	104
Artapanus		IV, 6, 4	104
<i>Peri Ioudaiōn</i> , Fragg. 3	65	Flavius Josephus	
Athanasius		<i>Antiquitates Iudaeorum</i>	
<i>De incarnatione Verbi</i>		II, 255	65
16	36	II, 311	42
18	135	<i>De bello Iudaico</i>	
<i>Catena</i> , <i>On Jude</i>	68, 69	V, 7, 4 (§§ 317–330)	117
Clement of Alexandria		<i>Gospel of Peter</i>	
<i>Adumbrationes in Epistulam Iudae</i>		5	44
	67	40	51–52
<i>Stromateis</i> I, 151–157	65–66	Hermas	
<i>Constitutiones Apostolorum</i>		<i>Pastor</i> , Sim. 9,6,1	52
V, 14, 1	13	Hippolytus	
<i>Corpus hermeticum</i> I,1	52	<i>Refutatio</i> , IX, 13, 2–3	52
Dioscurides		<i>Letter of Lentulus</i>	62, 54,
<i>De materia medica</i> , I, 109	162		56
Epiphanius		<i>Letters of Pilate and Herod</i>	34
<i>Panarion</i>		Methodius of Olympos	
19, 4, 1–2	52	<i>De lepra</i> , 9, 1	13
30, 17, 6–7	52	<i>Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum</i> , 13	
45, 4, 5	12		13
51, 26–27	39	Origen	
51, 26, 1	44	<i>Contra Celsum</i> , II, 64	5
51, 26, 3	45	<i>De principiis</i> , III, 2, 1	67
53, 1, 9	46	<i>Scholia in Canticum Canticorum</i> ,	
		5:11	60

<i>Paradosis of Pilate</i> , 10	34, 177	Theodorus Anagnostes	
Pseudo-Oecumenius		<i>Historia ecclesiastica</i> , Frg. 11	62
<i>Commentary on Jude</i>	68		
<i>Story of Joseph of Arimathaea</i>		Victorinus of Pettau	
1–2	46	<i>De fabrica mundi</i> , 3	46
2, 1	46	<i>Vita beate virginis Marie et Salvatoris</i>	
2, 2	47	<i>rhythmica</i>	
<i>Synodal Letter to Theophilus</i>	57, 59	3124–3127	59
<i>The Names of the Twelve Apostles and</i>		3134–3139	59
<i>their Parents</i>	14,	3148–3315	57
	16–33	3148–3151	61
	<i>passim</i> ,	3184	60
	183–184		

### 3. Coptic Texts

<i>Apocryphes coptes</i> (Revillout)		145, 159,	
fragm. 5	135	163	
<i>Apocryphon of John</i> , Synopsis		<i>On the Resurrection</i>	79–81, 145
(Waldstein-Wisse)		<i>On the Resurrection and the Passion</i>	
3, 3–12	51, 55		24, 54, 71,
62, 12–13	35		81–87, 112,
Athanasius of Alexandria (Ps.-)			125, 157
<i>On the resurrection of Lazarus</i>		<i>On New Sunday</i>	19, 25, 28,
	6, 135		30, 87–92,
<i>On the Passion of the Lord</i>			112
	143	<i>On the Virgin Mary</i>	93–97,
Basil of Caesarea (Ps.-)			114–116, 117,
<i>On Mary Theotokos</i>	11		118, 119, 139,
Benjamin of Alexandria			145, 179
<i>On the Wedding at Cana</i>	26, 112	<i>On the Holy Cross</i>	79, 98–105,
<i>Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ</i>			112, 117, 118,
17	157		119, 127, 137
18	159	<i>On Mary Magdalene</i>	11, 105–111,
29–38	145		112
58	23, 25	Cyril of Jerusalem (Ps.-) ?	
<i>Coptic Acrostic Hymns</i>		<i>In Canticum Vineae</i>	71
Hymn 10, 24	143	<i>In 24 Seniores</i>	71
Cyril of Jerusalem (Ps.-)		Epiphanius of Salamis (Ps.-)	
<i>On the Life and the Passion of Christ</i>		<i>On the Virgin Mary</i>	97
	73–77 and	Evodius of Rome (Ps.-)	
	<i>passim</i>	<i>On the Passion and the Resurrection</i>	
<i>On the Passion and the Resurrection</i>			42, 125, 159,
	50, 77–79,		163, 179
	80, 97, 113,	<i>On the Dormition of the Virgin</i>	
	117, 118, 119,		15, 127

<i>Gospel of Mary</i>		<i>Sahidic Fragments</i> (Robinson)	
18, 7–8	159	I, 9	97
<i>Gospel of Thomas</i> , Prologue	21	I, 12	97
<i>Historia Sacra</i>	23, 27	IV, 14	155
<i>History of Joseph the Carpenter</i>		<i>Stories about Cyril, Theophilus a.o.</i>	
	10		3, 4
John Chrysostom (Ps.-)		Theodore of Antioch (Ps.-)	
<i>On the Resurrection and the Apostles</i>		<i>On Theodore the General</i>	24
	15, 184–185	Theodosius of Alexandria	
<i>On John the Baptist</i>	10	<i>On the Assumption of Mary</i>	
<i>On the Four Bodiless Living Creatures</i>			11, 96, 97,
	11		143
<i>List of the Apostles</i> (on ostraca)		Theophilus of Alexandria (Ps.-)	
	16–17, 19,	<i>On the Virgin Mary</i>	112
	20, 21, 31,	<i>On John the Baptist</i>	133
	32, 185–186	Timothy of Alexandria (Ps.-)	
<i>Manichaean Psalmbook I</i> , 127		<i>On the Angels of Death, Abbaton</i>	
	40, 45		10
<i>On the Origin of the World</i> , 81		<i>On the Archangel Michael</i>	
	109		10
<i>On the Virgin Mary and the Birth of Christ</i>			
	10, 95		

#### 4. Arabic, Syriac and Ethiopic Texts

<i>Cave of Treasures</i> (Syriac), 109–111	<i>Mythological Acts of the Apostles</i>
<i>Didascalia apostolorum</i> , 21 (Syriac),	(Arabic), 27
12–13, 39–49 <i>passim</i> , 151, 189	Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem
Ibn Kabar	<i>On the Assumption of Mary</i> (Ethio-
<i>Lamp of Darkness</i> (Arabic), 15, 16, 19,	pic), 11
29–33 <i>passim</i>	<i>Synaxary, Arabic Jacobite</i> , 27



## INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

- Abraham, 147  
 Adam, 28, 109, 143, 145, 177  
 Adam, 78  
 Afrûn, 17, 21  
 Ammia, 30  
 Anastasis Church, 77, 79, 99, 102  
 Andrew, 16, 19, 32, 33, 129  
 Andron, 17, 28  
 Anna, 94, 106  
 Annarichus, 94, 104  
 Annas, 84, 139  
 Annas, 84  
 Antioch, 17, 21, 28  
 Antiochene, 21  
 Antonius the Shoemaker, 78, 97  
 Aphron, *see* Afrûn  
 apostles, parents and crafts of, 14–33, 183–186  
 April, 42, 45  
 Armaneen, 17  
 Arpocratius (*see also* Carpocratius), 93, 94, 97  
 Ascalon, 99, 112  
 Askanâ, 17, 29  
  
 Bachius, 74, 98–99, 112, 113, 128  
 Balinos, 18, 29  
 Barabbas, 48, 171  
 Barjona, mother of Peter and Andrew, 16, 19  
 Bartholomew, 17, 21–27, 31, 32, 33, 129  
 Bethsaida, 16, 17, 19, 20  
 books, discovery of ancient, 9–11  
  
 Caiaphas, 45, 46, 47, 49, 75, 84, 133, 161, 179  
 Cana, 18  
 Canaan, 173  
 Capernaum, 82  
 Carpocratius (*see also* Arpocratius), 78  
 Carpus, 50  
  
 Castor the Jew, 78, 79, 115, 117  
 catechesis, 179  
*Cave of Treasures*, 109–111  
 Chairotheia, 18, 29  
 Choiakh, 29th of, 139  
 Christ (*see also* Jesus)  
     external appearance, 56–64, 151  
     cloth, 63–64  
     divinity of body, 173  
     docetic body, 84  
     hair, 60–62  
     in Byzantine art, 57–58  
     nose and eyebrows, 62–63  
     real suffering, 78  
     skin, 59–60  
 Christodorus of Antioch, 102  
 Church of the Venerable Cross, 102  
 cistern of light, 173, 175  
 Cleopas, 89, 94, 100  
 Constantine I, 101, 104  
 Constantine II, 77 (?), 102, 104  
*Constitutions of the Apostles*, 23, 75, 76, 163, 177  
 Cross, discovery of, 100–102  
 Cycle of Cyrillian homilies, 111–112, 116, 120  
 Cyril of Jerusalem, of Jewish descent, 78, 94, 119  
  
 Dakima ibn Youkhan, 29  
 Dalimâ ibn Bûhân, 29  
 Darwsas, 18, 29  
 David, father of Mary Magdalene, 106  
 Diaphanes, 17, 20, 21  
 Didascalia Apostolorum, 12–13, 39–49  
     *passim*, 151, 189  
 Didymus, *see* Thomas  
 Diwnanous, 17, 21  
  
 eagle, 173, 175  
 Ebion, 93, 94, 97

- Edessa, 27  
 Egypt, 145, 173  
 Elizabeth, 94  
 Elsakher, 17, 21  
 Emmaus, 89  
 Ephata, 101  
 Epiphanius Monachos, 57  
 Epiphanius  
     *Ancoratus*, 94  
     *Letter on Holy Week*, 39–50 *passim*,  
         186–189  
 Eusebius, 50  
 Eusignius, 101  
 Eutychia, 17, 28  
 Eve, 109, 127  
  
 Flood, 109  
  
 Gabriel, 109  
 Galilee, 18, 29, 141, 167  
 Gallion, 30  
 gardener, 22–25  
 Golgotha, 100, 101, 109  
 Great Preparation Day, 157  
 Great (Week of the) Pascha, 2–3, 157  
  
 Hamuli, 1  
     manuscripts, 1–2  
     St. Michael's monastery, 1, 4, 71, 179  
 Helena, 77, 79, 101, 102, 104  
 Herod, 47, 48, 49, 75, 107, 167  
     letter to Pilate, 169  
 Hierapolis, 17, 28  
 Hierokates, 23  
 Hieroke, 16, 19  
 Hierokleia, 16, 19  
 Holy Week, 39–50  
  
 Ibn Kabar, 15  
 Inatmen, 18, 29  
 Irenaeus, 77, 78, 79, 94, 100, 101, 104  
 Isaac the Samaritan (of Joppe), 98, 103,  
     115, 117  
 Israel, 145  
 Issachar, 17, 21  
 Italian, 27  
 Italy, 17, 23  
  
 Jacob, 125  
 Jairus, 133  
 James, 16, 19–20, 32, 94, 129, 131  
 James, son of Alphaeus, 17, 28–29, 32,  
     129  
 James, the Brother of the Lord, 18, 28, 30  
 Jašû', 17, 21  
 Jerusalem, 21, 127, 143, 145, 149  
 Jesus (*see also* Christ)  
     healings on the Sabbath, 36–37, 135  
     suffering, 163  
     tomb, 100  
 Joachim, 94  
 Joanna, 19  
 Joannas, 19  
 Joanne, 16, 19  
 John, 16, 19–20, 32, 33, 78, 82, 85, 94, 107,  
     108, 118, 129, 131, 151, 153, 177  
 John, father of Peter and Andrew, 16, 19  
 John Mark, 9, 11, 127  
 John the Baptist, 129  
 Jonah, 19  
 Joseph of Arimathea, 4, 78, 85, 102, 107,  
     113, 114, 139, 141  
 Joseph, 92, 139  
 Joseph, bishop of Jerusalem, 102  
 Joseph, son of Jacob, 125  
 Josephus, 77, 79, 94, 101, 104  
 Joshua, 17, 21  
 Jouna, 19  
 Juda, bishop of Jerusalem, 101, 102  
 Judas, 18, 30, 74, 75, 82, 92, 127, 129, 135,  
     147, 149, 153, 155, 157  
     wife of, 74, 75, 135, 147, 149, 151, 155,  
         157–159  
 Judas Cyriacus legend, 104  
 Judas, son of James, 17, 18, 21, 27, 30  
 Julianos, 17, 20  
 Jûnânâ, 16, 19  
 Justinian I, 64  
 Justinian II, 58  
  
 Kallion, 18, 30  
 Kamia, 18, 30  
 Kamina, 30  
 Kedron, 153  
 kiss of peace, 159

- Laban, 125  
 Lazarus, 82, 141  
 Lebbaeus, 17, 27  
 Letia, 18  
*Letter of Lentulus*, 57  
 Levi, 18, 29, 133  
 Liaos, 17, 27  
 Luke, 14, 18, 30, 108, 133  
 Lysia, 17, 21
- Marcellus, 50  
 Mark, 18, 30, 108, 129  
 Mark, bishop of Jerusalem, 102  
 Martha, 141  
 Mary, 74, 78, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 92, 93–97  
     *passim*, 106, 107, 108, 118, 139, 145, 149, 151, 155, 177  
     Commemoration, 95  
     death, 108  
     Dormition and Assumption, 96, 97  
     identified with other Marys, 94  
     normal human being, 77–78, 93  
 Mary, mother of John and James, 16  
 Mary, mother of John Mark, 127  
 Mary Magdalene, 94, 105–111 *passim*, 135  
 Mary of Cleopas, 94  
 Mary of James, 94  
 Mary, sister of Lazarus, 141  
 Matthew, 18, 29, 33, 129, 133  
 Matthias, 14, 18, 30, 92, 129  
 Melchi, 66  
 Michael, 67–69  
 Miriam, 80  
 moon, day of the, 42, 45, 127, 153  
 Moses, 65–69, 77, 98, 137, 143, 149, 161
- Nain, 82, 135  
 Nakrios, 17, 28  
 Namosaya, 110  
 Nathanael, 29  
 Nazareth, 18, 29  
 Nekrophanes, 17, 28  
 New Sunday, 88  
 Nicodemus, 74, 75, 85, 102, 107, 113, 114, 139, 165  
 Nisan, 42, 49
- Ostraca, Coptic, 15, 185–186  
 Ourania, 17, 21
- papyrus, 66–67, 161  
 Parmoute, 42, 45, 73, 104, 125, 127  
     1st of, 42, 74, 149  
     10th of, 43, 149  
     11th of, 43  
     12th of, 45, 76, 179  
     13th of, 48  
 Passover anticipated, 44–45, 187–188  
 Paul  
     Apostle, 14, 18, 30, 92, , 108, 129  
     Coptic name, 3, 179  
 Peter, 16, 19, 30, 32, 33, 74, 78, 80, 84, 90, 91, 92, 94, 108, 129, 131, 145, 151, 153, 159–161, 179  
 Philemon, 107  
 Philip, 17, 20, 31, 32, 33, 129  
 Philip, father of Simon Cananites, 18, 29  
 Philisanos, 17, 20  
 Philo, 100, 104  
 Pilate, 47, 48, 49, 75, 84, 85, 167, 169, 173  
     a crypto-Christian, 84  
     apocryphal literature on, 33–34, 36, 38  
     dream of, 35, 48, 75–76, 173, 175–177  
     letter to Herod, 167–169  
     meal with Jesus, 34–35, 48, 75, 171  
     original name Pontius, 165  
 Procla, dream of, 35, 49, 76, 173–175, 177  
 Pseudo Cyril of Jerusalem, Homilies  
     1. *On the Life and the Passion of Christ*, 73–77, 131–181 and *passim*  
     2. *On the Passion and the Resurrection*, 77–79  
     3. *On the Resurrection*, 79–81  
     4. *On the Resurrection and the Passion*, 81–87  
     5. *On New Sunday*, 87–92  
     6. *On the Virgin Mary*, 93–97  
     7. *On the Holy Cross*, 98–105  
     8. *On Mary Magdalene*, 105–111
- Rhoea, 17, 20, 21  
 Rhoukos, 18, 29

- Rowaass, 17, 21  
 Rufus, 100
- Sabastiyya, 17, 29  
 Saints of Old Testament, 83  
 Salans, 17, 28  
 Salim, 30  
 Sariah, 17, 20  
 Sarton, 94, 97  
 Satan, 67–69  
 Selene, 17, 28  
 seller / grower of greens, 25–26  
 Severus of Antioch, 53  
 Severus, unknown heretic, 78, 97  
 Simeon, 137  
 Simon Barjonah, 19  
 Simon Cananites, 18, 21, 29–30, 31, 32, 33, 129  
     *see also* Dalîmâ and Dakima  
 Simon Zelotes, 18, 29, 30  
 Simon, secretary of Mary Magdalene, 106  
 Sophia, 17, 20  
 Sosthenes, 17, 21  
 Soupouhes, 3, 4, 181  
 Synklêtikê, 106  
*Synodal Letter to Theophilus*, 57
- Tabernacles, feast of the, 141  
 Tâûklîjjâ, 16, 20
- Thaeophelia, 16, 20  
 Thaddaeus, 17, 27–28, 32, 33, 129  
 Theodosius of Alexandria, 96  
 Theodosius, deacon of Cyril, 127, 129  
 Theokleia, 20  
 Theopas, 89  
 Theophilia, 20  
 Theophilus, 107, 109, 110  
 Thomas, 17, 20–21, 32, 80, 89–90, 91, 92, 129  
 Thoout, 104  
     17th of, 98, 102  
 Tiberius, 107  
 Tobe, 129  
     11th of, 129  
     21th of, 93, 95, 96, 97
- Ūryās, 17, 29
- Vespasian, 110  
*Vita beate virginis Marie et Salvatoris  
     rhythmica*, 57  
 Vivianus, 50  
 Youna, 16
- Zarkwa, 18, 29  
 Zebedee, 16, 19, 131  
 Zechariah, 137  
 Zenon, 18, 30

